

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BREATHING MAY BE HAZARDOUS  
TO YOUR HEALTH

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the more that information is gathered, the clearer the picture we have of air pollution's harmful effects on our health, our material goods, and our quality of life. In the half-dozen years since the passage of the Clean Air Act of 1970, study after study has documented that neither the Congress nor the Environmental Protection Agency has erred on the side of caution in limiting emissions of air pollutants. If anything, our current air quality standards have been shown not to be strict enough. Although the pollution controls mandated by the Clean Air Act are designed to protect against the ravages caused by air pollution, the latest research clearly shows that the margins of safety provided by these standards are just barely adequate to meet this need. In many instances, deleterious health effects have been shown to occur at levels at or slightly below the primary standard—a standard which is often violated in several regions throughout the country. In other instances, researchers are doubtful that these emissions limitations are stringent enough to protect our population against cancer, mutagenesis, and birth defects—all of which may be associated with air pollution.

The most comprehensive and informative review of these issues to appear since the Clean Air Act of 1970 was written into law is contained in the Commerce Committee report (H. Rept. 94-1175) to accompany H.R. 10498, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1976. Relying on the analyses of dozens of researchers and hundreds of studies, the committee's report lays out in clear and concise terms the compelling facts regarding the grave effects of air pollution and human health.

A recent column by Jack Anderson highlighted a few of the disturbing findings contained in the report. As the clean air legislation will be debated in the very near future, I urge my colleagues to review Mr. Anderson's column, and study the committee's report:

BREATHING MAY BE HAZARDOUS TO YOUR  
HEALTH

(By Jack Anderson)

Nine years after the first major attempt to curb air pollution, the Environmental Protection Agency is still "very uneasy" about whether the air is safe to breathe.

Not only could the air around us be hazardous to our health, but it may also be killing vegetation. An environmental phenomenon called "acid rain," for example, is destroying crops and even timber.

These ominous findings are contained in a report, which the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is preparing. The final draft declares tersely that the EPA is worried "about the adequacy of the margin of safety provided by the current air quality standards."

If sulphur dioxide pollution were only slightly worse than the standards allow, for example, people could die of air poisoning. Pollutants other than sulphur dioxide, the report adds, could leave a "slim" or "non-existent" safety margin for the aged, sick, pregnant and infants.

The standards used to gauge pollution, according to the National Academy of Sciences, are unproved and possibly false. "It is impossible at this time," states the report, "to establish an ambient air concentration for any pollutant—other than zero—below which it is certain that no human beings will be adversely affected."

The report contends that the national standards "are not designed to protect against genetic mutation, birth defects or cancer which may be associated with air pollution."

It is now generally recognized, for example, that cancer stems 70 to 90 per cent from environmental causes. Despite improving cancer treatment, the report points out, "people died of cancer at a higher rate" during the first seven months of 1975 "than at any time since the government began keeping nationwide mortality data 42 years ago."

The report links the cancer increase with air pollution. Conversely, "the seriousness and frequency of pollution-related diseases have been reduced" in major metropolitan areas where pollution has been decreased.

There is "increasing evidence," according to the report, that pollution has an adverse effect not only upon public health but upon the public purse. The sulphur dioxide in the air is costing farmers uncounted millions in crop damage.

Studies discussed in the report show that crops suffer leaf damage, growth inhibition and actual destruction from airborne sulphur dioxide. Even at levels below the permissible standards, declares the report, "pollutants may have damaging effects on vegetation."

As a measure of the economic impact this has upon the harvest, it has been documented that sulphur dioxide pollution at half the allowable level has caused a 15 per cent reduction in the wheat yield.

What makes this all the more alarming is that much of the nation's wheat is grown in the Great Plains states where the massive use of coal is scheduled. The coal-fired industrialization, which is planned for this area, is a major source of sulphur dioxide pollution.

Not only wheat but other cash crops are susceptible to pollution damage. Among those listed in the report are barley, oats, oranges, peanuts, pine trees, soybeans, spinach and tobacco. These crops can be damaged, the report stresses, by air that is actually cleaner than the national standards allow.

The damage comes partly from "acid rain," which is formed by the sulphur dioxide mixing with the moisture in the atmosphere. One study shows that the acid rainfall has increased a disturbing 270 per cent between 1956 and 1973 in the eastern section of North America. In some small areas of the northeast, the average acidity of the polluted rain is equivalent to tomato juice.

This atmospheric tomato juice is potent enough in some places to destroy trees. The Forest Service is concerned about reports of a "substantial reduction in timber volume caused by chronic low levels of (sulphur dioxide) or acid rain."

Official concern has been heightened by Swedish estimates that by the year 2000, acid rainfall from as far as 600 miles away in Great Britain and other European indus-

trial nations may wipe out between two and seven per cent of the entire Swedish softwood forest.

The report emphasizes the need for preventing the air we have now from getting worse. Without new air standards, for example, the air around the Grand Canyon will decline to a "secondary" level of sulphur dioxide pollution.

At that level, the air will sting the eyes of tourists and reduce visibility from the normal 70 miles to about 15 miles. Unless the pollution controls are tightened, other pollutants would reduce the visibility at the Grand Canyon to 12.5 miles or less. Today, on a clear day, tourists can see as far as 100 miles.

"It must be admitted," the report concedes, "that there is no hard cause-effect data now in existence showing that human cancer, birth defects or genetic breaks have occurred because of ambient air pollution levels now found in cities, towns and rural areas."

The long "lag time" of 20 to 30 years between the exposure to cancer-causing agents and the actual development of the cancer, notes the report, makes direct cause-and-effect difficult to establish. But the supporting data is grimly persuasive.

The report, echoing the words of the Council on Environmental Quality, argues that if scientific "certainty" is required before cancer-causing substances can be controlled, "counting dead bodies through an after-the-fact epidemiology study then becomes virtually the only way the government could prove its case."

ISRAELI RESCUE RAID HAILED BY  
ALL FOES OF INTERNATIONAL  
TERRORISM

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the entire civilized world is still marveling at the daring and courageous actions taken by the Israeli Government to secure the release of some 100 hostages who had been seized by international terrorists and kidnapped to Uganda.

The Israeli effort is certainly to be commended by all foes of international terrorism. The seizure of the Air France jet enroute to Paris from Tel Aviv, was one of the most brazen acts of terrorism in recent times. It was obvious to the leaders of Israel that only strong and decisive military action would lead to the safe release of the hostages, for the terrorists and their prisoners were being harbored in Uganda, whose leader, President Amin, has repeatedly indicated support for terrorist acts.

Actual details of the Israeli raid are somewhat scanty because of the desire of the Israeli Government to maintain secrecy. However, what we have learned about the raid indicates that Israel planned and executed their rescue operation with the highest degree of accuracy and ultimate success. The bravery displayed by Israeli units in carrying out this dangerous mission is unquestioned.

Besides rescuing the lives of their countrymen, the Israeli raid has given a clear message—acts of terrorism shall not be tolerated. The concept of large-scale military actions to combat terrorism had not been utilized in the past, but it has been proven without doubt, to be a most effective means of aiding the innocent persons who become the sacrificial lambs of terrorists. Hopefully this strong demonstration by Israeli will deter future terrorism.

The raid was not without its tragic events. Once the Israeli commandos began their invasion of the Entebbe Airport, they were fired upon by surprised Ugandan troops. In the aftermath, three hostages and the brave leader of the Israeli forces, Lt. Jonathen Netanyahu, were killed. This was the only black mark on an otherwise successful action.

What made this raid even more significant, was that it was pulled off literally under the nose of President Amin, whose arrogance and support for the causes of world disruption and violence, makes him one of the more despised world leaders. Amin's threats of retaliation against Israel and Kenya must be closely heeded in the coming weeks, but hopefully, they are only idle utterances of a man who was clearly outsmarted on his own home field.

A lesson should have been learned from this action. Tepidness in dealing with international terrorism will only result in its continuation and perpetuation. Not only must we fight back against those engaged in terrorism, but also against those nations and leaders who harbor these terrorists. They are nothing more than accomplices to these violators of international law and they must be dealt with as such.

The nation and leaders of Israel are justifiably basking in their successes. They have bolstered a sagging national morale while also dealing a strong blow against the evil forces of terrorism. The sincere congratulations of this Congress and the American public are extended to President Rabin, Defense Minister Peres and of course, to the outstanding heroes who actually partook in the raid. Let the entire free world continue to be vigilant in its opposition to those forces which are bent on the promotion of world disorder and violence.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 19, I was on business in Delaware and missed several recorded votes in the House. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 508, "aye."  
Rollcall No. 509, "aye."  
Rollcall No. 510, "aye."  
Rollcall No. 511, "nay."  
Rollcall No. 512, "aye."

### SOCIAL SECURITY GRADE CREEP EATS INTO TRUST FUND RESERVES

### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, because of high unemployment, inflation and, in the long run, a declining birth rate, the social security trust funds are declining and additional taxes will be required to insure the continuation of promised retirement and disability benefits. It is, therefore, more important than ever that the Social Security Administration operate with a minimum of redtape and administrative overhead.

I recently asked the Civil Service Commission whether any studies of possible grade creep or excessive numbers of high-grade personnel doing lower grade work had been conducted at the Social Security Administration. I have just received the following report from the Civil Service Commission which indicates serious trouble in Social Security employment and promotion policies.

We have not conducted any special studies addressed specifically to "grade creep" or to the numbers of high grade positions as SSA. However, our general personnel management evaluation coverage includes position management and classification and would deal with your concerns in that context. During Fiscal Year 1976 we concluded general evaluations at SSA Program Centers in Philadelphia and Kansas City, and at the Data Operations Center in Albuquerque. Program Centers are part of the Bureau of Retirement and Survivors Insurance (BRSI); the Data Operations Center is part of the Bureau of Data Processing.

At the Philadelphia Program Center, 15 positions were desk audited to determine whether they were properly classified: 9 positions were found to be overgraded; 6 of them were at or above GS-11. In addition to requiring that SSA review and properly classify positions as indicated, we recommended that the Program Center initiate regular position management studies to review the classification, number, and mix (clerical vs professional) of positions within each organization on a systematic basis.

At the Kansas City Program Center, 45 positions were audited: 8 positions were found to be overgraded; however, because of additional positions identical to those audited, downgrading could actually affect 17 positions, 4 of them at GS-12 and GS-13. Here again, we indicated the need for procedures for manpower control and regular classification review on the part of the Program Center.

At the Albuquerque Data Operations Center we conducted a general personnel management evaluation in the fall of 1974, followed by a classification/position management review a year later. As a result of these reviews, a number of the supervisory and Data Entry Operator positions were found to be overgraded. Because a large segment of the Data Entry Operators positions are identical to positions located in other Data Operations Centers, we have been working closely with SSA and HEW to assure the proper alignment of these positions nationwide.

When 60 percent of the positions examined at one major field office are found to be overgraded, it is obvious that we are talking about enormous sums of

money being diverted out of the trust funds for the payment of administrative costs rather than for the payment of benefits to the retired and disabled.

While the grade levels involved at the Albuquerque office are GS-3's and GS-4's in the \$7,102 to \$10,370 range, many of the other overclassifications are more serious. For example, a GS-11 is now starting for \$16,255 and can range up to \$21,133. A GS-13 now starts at \$22,906 and rises to \$29,782.

For the first time since its founding, the Social Security Administration faces some difficult days ahead. Administrative costs are already draining \$2 billion a year away from the trust funds. It is past time for the administrators of the trust funds to begin to run a tighter operation.

### THE IMPERIALS DRUM AND BUGLE CORPS

### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there is a combined continuing Bicentennial celebration and youth organization "happening" in my congressional district in Illinois which makes obvious something which I believe has special national significance and promise for the future.

The Niles Township Bicentennial Commission in north suburban Chicago, involving Evanston, Skokie, and Morton Grove, has put full control for a large part of this year's important continuing Bicentennial commemorative festivities in the hands of a particular type of youth organization which I believe represents the Bicentennial spirit and a unique promise for communities nationwide.

This youth organization, the Imperials Drum and Bugle Corps, with 50 years of parading and field competition experience, is the Nation's most long term continuously operating corps. Now, as since its inception, it is organized as a community activity for youths 9 through 20 years, regardless of sex, race, and so forth.

Most members join with little or no previous experience and the organization provides professional instruction, instruments—many types of drums and other percussion instruments, plus bugle types and flags, and uniforms. This is general practice for all drum and bugle corps. Operating funds come from sponsoring organizations, booster clubs, and earnings from parades and field competitions.

Although the Imperials are the Nation's oldest corps, this type of activity has experienced most of its growth during the past 20 years and is accelerating rapidly. Hundreds of corps are now operating across America, though with the greatest concentrations in the Midwest and on both coasts. The three corps judged best this past year, for example, represented one from each of these regions.

This type of year-round activity is



contributing in a most wholesome physical and artistic manner as a youth activity, providing positive discipline, spirit, and cohesiveness—to say nothing of sheer entertainment. It is working, young persons respond to music, and today's drum and bugle corps play everything from popular to classic to jazz selections in their repertoires.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that at a time when many public and private grammar and high schools are cutting back on their music and other programs, because of economic squeezes, that drum and bugle corps activity can more than fill that gap for our youth—and the entire community. I recommend it.

As the Nation is now beginning its third century, I cannot think of a more appropriate positive indicator of our continuing vitality than this involvement of our youth.

#### TULSA CARPENTERS SCORE HIGH MARKS

### HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, recently the Tulsa Carpenters' Union Local No. 943 participated in the union's State convention in Oklahoma City, Okla. The Tulsa Local No. 943 was fortunate to win all five divisions. They won first place in the first-, second-, third-, and fourth-year divisions in the carpenters' competition, and first place in the fourth-year cabinetmakers competition. In the past 4 years they have won 17 of the 18 possible contests in the same convention, establishing total domination in the competition.

In recognizing this fine organization, we should also acknowledge the importance this skilled trade has in the development of our homes and the growth of our cities. When mentioning the trade of carpenters we usually allude to the idea of cabinetmakers or minor work in the homes. We often fail to recognize how the carpenter trade warrants professionally. Since the beginning of our history we have had to use our hands to build and create. Throughout our communities we witness the mark of craftsmanship, and particularly in my district it is noticed a great deal more. We have an advantage over many other areas, in that, we are able to appreciate the craft because of many frame houses and buildings.

Despite our efforts to mass produce, the carpenters union has withstood the dilemma of advancing technology. The diligence of the craftsmen is characterized by their stamina needed for the trade.

I would also like to go on record that the expert work these people provide for their communities does not go unnoticed and we are appreciative for their services rendered. I am confident the demand for these skilled carpenters will increase as they are not easily substituted. They are an integral part of the building and developing industry.

#### POST OFFICE NEEDS COMPETITION

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Postal Service is clearly in trouble. It is expensive, inefficient and, at the same time, in possession of a Government-mandated monopoly. With no competition, there is little incentive for it to improve its services or lower its costs. As long as it feels that its inefficiency will be rewarded by increased governmental appropriations, such inefficiency will continue.

At the present time, the private express statutes provide the Postal Service with a monopoly over the carriage of first class mail. Without competition there is no incentive to improve, to cut costs, to innovate, and ultimately to satisfy the postal consumer. The answer to our problems in this area will be found with an end to the private express statutes. Finally, interest in my long-standing legislative proposals to repeal the Government monopoly over the carriage of first class mail is growing. There are now 31 cosponsors in the House and two similar bills have been introduced in the Senate. The measure has also received the editorial support of such papers as the Chicago Tribune, the Chicago Daily News, and the Wall Street Journal.

In a recent syndicated column, Allan C. Brownfeld declared that:

There is no logical reason for the government to have a first class mail delivery monopoly. . . . The Postal Service claims to make a profit only on the delivery of first class mail. It loses money on second and third class deliveries. Yet, private carriers, which are permitted to deliver second and third class mail, make a profit.

The U.S. Postal Service, Mr. Brownfeld notes, "is not a business, and does not have to make a profit. It is a bureaucratic Government body which has no incentive whatever to operate in an efficient manner \* \* \* If we want postal service to be less costly and more responsive to our needs, the answer is clearly to restore competition."

"If we do not end the governmental monopoly," Mr. Brownfeld declares, "we will face only higher costs and drastic cutbacks in service. Now is the time to act \* \* \*"

I wish to share with my colleagues the column, "First Class Mail Monopoly Stands In Way Of Necessary Competition," by Allan C. Brownfeld, as it appeared in the Phoenix Gazette of June 19, 1976, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

FIRST-CLASS MAIL MONOPOLY STANDS IN WAY OF NECESSARY COMPETITION  
(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

Finally, everyone seems agreed that the U.S. Postal Service is too costly, too inefficient and too much of a burden to be carried any longer by American taxpayers. Unfortunately, it has taken too long a time for this conclusion to be reached.

Only six years ago, the Congress felt that increasing costs, rising subsidies and declining service required the creation of a quasi-governmental corporation to take over

the delivery of the nation's mails. Why Congress felt that a "quasi-governmental" body would be any more efficient than an actual agency of government is difficult to understand. They have now discovered, of course, that it is not. Instead of inefficiency being corrected, there has been a 117 per cent increase in the first class postal rates (from 6 cents to 13 cents), a six per cent increase in the letter sorting error rate and, rather than self-sufficiency by 1977 as envisioned, a continuing increase in taxpayer subsidization.

After all of this, we now hear from Postmaster General Benjamin Ballar that, unless further cutbacks in service are implemented, the Postal Service is facing "a potential disaster." Among the cutbacks now called for are three-day-a-week delivery, curbside rather than doorstep delivery, and a further reduction in business mail delivery.

What Ballar seems not to understand is that the cutbacks he calls for can only make matters worse. In this connection, Rep. Philip M. Crane, R-Ill., points out that "... rather than solving the problem, cutting service simply exacerbates it. By making the service less accessible, people are discouraged from using the service, the volume of mail declines, and since labor costs cannot easily be reduced with cutbacks, further rate hikes are necessary. In short, a vicious cycle develops, one that is compounded by the fact that electronic transfers and the like are causing a reduction in mail volume anyway. Last year, for instance, mail volume dropped by nine-tenths of a percentage point, and from all indications this trend will continue."

Those who urge that the Postal Service be placed on a "pay as you go" basis by increasing the governmental subsidy are simply admitting that there is no way to make the delivery of the mail more efficient. If we were to follow this path, it is estimated that the cost of a first class letter might hit 36 cents by 1984 and that subsidies could rise as high as \$3 billion in the next few years.

What is needed is an approach that offers an incentive for increased efficiency. Bureaucratic government management provides precisely the opposite—no incentive at all for efficiency! Today, by law, the Postal Service has monopoly power to deliver first class mail. While private carriers may deliver other classes of mail, they are forbidden by law from delivering first class letters. The result: we are a captive consuming public to the U.S. Postal Service and it, for its part, has no need to please us.

There is no logical reason for the government to have a first-class mail delivery monopoly. Economist Milton Friedman notes that "There have been many private ventures—including the storied Pony Express, which failed when the telegraph line (also private) reached California and provided even faster service. Many others succeeded—which was precisely what led postal officials to foster, over many decades, a succession of congressional enactments to outlaw private mail delivery." Dr. Friedman concludes that "Competition would benefit the general public!"

The Postal Service claims to make a profit only on the delivery of first class mail. It loses money on second and third class deliveries. Yet, private carriers, which are permitted to deliver second and third class mail, make a profit. The New Jersey based Purolator Company, the biggest in the private courier business with 1975 sales of \$298 million, showed sales up 24 per cent last year.

The Postal Service is not a business, and does not have to make a profit. It is a bureaucratic government body which has no incentive whatever to operate in an efficient manner. Forbes magazine commented that "The Post Office is still more feathered and pork barrel than it is business." If we want postal service to be less costly and more

responsive to our needs, the answer is clearly to restore competition.

The way to do this is simply by eliminating the Private Express Statutes which give the U.S. Postal Service a monopoly in the delivery of first class mail. Such legislation has been proposed by Rep. Crane and Sen. James L. Buckley, R-C-N.Y. In addition, the President's Council of Wage and Price Stability has underscored the need for competition in the delivery of first class mail. The council declared that "... permitting competition to the Postal Service's first class mail service probably would result in significant benefits to the economy and to the mail user."

If we do not end the governmental monopoly we will face only higher costs and drastic cutbacks in service. Now is the time to act, and the legislation before the Congress would provide the freedom and incentive necessary for the efficiency which bureaucracy is incapable of providing.

## BICENTENNIAL DEMONSTRATION WRAP UP: THE J4C

**HON. LARRY McDONALD**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Castroite-dominated July 4 Coalition—J4C—held its long-planned counter-Bicentennial 2½-mile march and rally in Philadelphia on Sunday, July 4. The turnout for the J4C event was by actual head count some 15,000 people—far below the 50,000 to 80,000 planned by the J4C organizers. Fully half the J4C marchers were Puerto Ricans, many with no political affiliation, brought to the demonstration for a holiday outing in buses chartered by the Castroite Communist Puerto Rican Socialist Party—PSP—from northern New Jersey and New York City.

Other marchers included representatives of the American Indian Movement—AIM; small group of blacks from the Republic of New Africa—RNA—and African People's Socialist Party; a token contingent from the Socialist Workers Party—SWP—and larger contingents from the Mass Party Organizing Committee—MPOC; the New American Movement—NAM; the Venceremos Brigade—VB; and homosexual groups.

In an effort to find issues which could attract large number of people to the J4C, the coalition raised a broad spectrum of issues. These ranged from calls for an independent—and Marxist, PSP-controlled—Puerto Rico through opposition to birth control and sterilization for the poor, to cuts in Federal taxpayer funded social welfare programs; to support for equal rights for homosexuals, complete sovereignty for American Indians, and passage of the equal rights amendment.

The July 4 Coalition's day of activities officially started with an ecumenical service attended by some 470 people at the Church of the Advocate. Unofficially, demonstrators began assembling at the head of the march shortly after day-break, while others littered the Church of the Advocate with their sleeping bags,

rucksacks, and unwashed bodies. Scheduled participants included Paul Mayer, New York Theological Seminary; Rev. Paul M. Washington, rector, Church of the Advocate; Rev. Mama Strobe, Detroit prison and community activist; Rev. Daniel Berrigan; Marilyn Clement, Inter-religious Foundation for Community Organization—IFCO—and National Council of Churches; Rev. Roberto Pena, Association of Hispanic Priests for Religious, Economic and Social Rights; and George Lakey of the Friends Peace Committee.

Missing from the religious service was Philadelphia's Muhammad Kenyatta. As the "independent" Marxist-Leninist tabloid, the Guardian noted:

Originally an active sponsor of the demonstration, Kenyatta resigned in late May \* \* \* denouncing the J4C as a "bunch of white hippies." He later testified on behalf of the government, falsely stating that the coalition might be planning violence because it had at one time been associated with the "Rich Off Our Backs" coalition, organized by the Revolutionary Communist Party."

Commencing more than an hour late, in part due to a quarrel between the American Indian Movement contingent and the combined African People's Socialist Party/Republic of New Africa contingent as to which minority group should be the leadoff, the parade took place in a shabby, all-black residential area past abandoned and boarded up houses bordering Fairmount Park, and ended in an unkempt ballfield near the East Park Reservoir.

Support for domestic and foreign terrorists featured prominently in the banners and placards carried by July 4 Coalition demonstrators. The subjects of J4C support included confessed and convicted revolutionary bank robber Susan Saxe; Lolita Lebron and four other terrorists from the old Puerto Rican Nationalist Party who are serving prison terms for the attempted assassination of President Truman and the shooting of Members of Congress; the internationally active terrorists of the Palestine Liberation Organization; and the American Indian Movement which has used terror tactics against moderate American Indian opponents and others.

Banners included those stating—

Free Lolita Lebron and All Political Prisoners; Remember Wounded Knee; Solidarity with the Palestinian People; National Independence for the Domestic Black Colony; Remember Attica; The Spirit of Mark Clark and Fred Hampton Lives; Stop Sterilization Abuse; Lesbians for Puerto Rican Independence—Your Struggle Is Our Struggle; Down with Racism from Boston to Soweto; Freedom for All African Prisoners of War; Jobs at Home Not Wars Abroad; Struggle to Build a New Communist International on a Real Trotskyist Basis—Global Class War to Smash Capitalism—Imperialism; Down with Apartheid—Power to Soweto; U.S. Out of Panama; Break the Blockade—End All Attacks on Cuba; Independence for Puerto Rico; Commie Faggots and Proud; Fight for Education by, for, and about Women; Free Susan Saxe; and Eat the Rich.

Alan Howard, the J4C "pressperson," described the march as "spirited, militant, and without disorder." Press agent Howard was no doubt referring by

"spirited" and "militant" to such chants as "They Say Cut Back; We Say Shoot Back!"

Among those acting as general masters of ceremony and rally "chairpersons" were William Kunstler, who has recently sought to aid the Baader-Meinhof terrorists on trial in Stuttgart; his law partner for many years, Arthur Kinoy, founder of the Mass Party Organizing Committee; Walter Rodriguez, Puerto Rican Union of Actors and Technicians; and Helen Sobell, wife of Morton Sobell, convicted with the Rosenbergs of espionage conspiracy as a member of a Communist spy ring.

Others who spoke or performed at the July 4 Coalition rally included:

Rev. Frederick Douglas Kirkpatrick, a folksinger and performer at many radical rallies who represented Deacons for Defense and Justice, a clandestine vigilante "armed self-defense" organization active in the mid-1960's. Kirkpatrick is running for president as the candidate of the National Black Political Assembly.

Rev. Paul Washington, rector, Church of the Advocate.

Rev. Bernard S. Lee, Southern Christian Leadership Conference—SCLC—substituting for Ralph Abernathy.

Karen DeCrow, president of the National Organization for Women—NOW—who spoke in support of the equal rights amendment. Miss DeCrow, attempting to present a more militant and "activist" image for NOW, brushed off the scattered jeers she received from some of the most extreme Leninist feminists with the comment, "the left hasn't cleaned up its act yet," obviously unlike Miss DeCrow's more sophisticated "act."

Dr. Helen Rodriguez, Committee to End Sterilization Abuse which charges a genocidal plot by the Government against poor minority women.

Juan Mari Bras, secretary-general of the Castroite communist Puerto Rican Socialist Party.

Harry X. Amana, columnist for a Philadelphia black newspaper, who read a message from convicted Charlotte 3 arsonist Jim Grant, one of the New Left's favorite "political prisoners," stating that "the people must wake up and rise up and direct their anger at this imperialist ruling class that runs our country."

Vernon Bellecourt, American Indian Movement.

Marie Runyon, now a New York State assemblywoman.

Dave Dellinger, who hoped that the J4C would set the stage for a new unity of "repressed groups" which would be the prime force behind a new revolutionary movement for "social justice."

Elaine Brown, chairwoman of the Black Panther Party and newly appointed member of the Berkeley School Board, who read a message from Congressman RON DELLUMS, calling for Puerto Rico's independence.

Milton Streets, a Philadelphia activist. Joe Waller, African Peoples Socialist Party.

The Stalinist Old Left was represented by Helen Gurewitz Sobell, wife of con-



victed atom spy Morton Sobell. Mrs. Sobell's unabashed support of a convicted murderer—Gary Tyler—the self-proclaimed leader of the terrorist Black Liberation Army—Joanne D. Chesimard, alias Asata Shakur—a confessed revolutionary bank robber—Susan Saxe—and the leader of the Puerto Rican terrorists who shot several Members of Congress in this Chamber in 1954—Lolita Lebron—was described by Workers World, the newspaper of the "independent" Trotskyist Workers World Party which has attached itself to the Castroite movement in an effort to gain wider support for its eclectic, or less charitably, opportunist politics:

Rally chairperson Helen Sobell, for 20 years the organizer of the Rosenberg-Sobell defense campaign, condemned the government for committing "massive injustices that rob us of our lives." She cited the huge prison system "teeming with Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, and poor white people," and sent the demonstration's solidarity to "our comrades jailed in the struggle—Gary Tyler, Asata Shakur (Joanne Chesimard), Susan Saxe, and Lolita Lebron."

Ms. Sobell read a letter to the rally from Asata Shakur of the Black Liberation Army. The U.S., wrote Sister Shakur, is "a country in the hands of a few, the Rockefellers, Mellons and Fords," while the poor and oppressed "are still enslaved after 200 years."

Juan Mari Bras, PSP secretary-general, described what he termed "U.S. colonial oppression" in Puerto Rico. This included the heavy investment of mainland capital in Puerto Rican businesses which provide jobs for thousands of island residents. Mari's speech was quieter in tone than usual and he did not draw the usual direct parallel between the PSP and the Cuban Communists which PSP Political Commission member Florencio Merced drew in July, 1975, when he said:

Cuba and Puerto Rico are sister nations. In our joint struggle we think of San Juan as the former tyrannical Saigon of the Caribbean and of Havana as our Hanoi. That portion of our homeland which begins in San Juan will also be free and socialist.

The Guardian—July 16, 1976—reported that Mari Bras welcomed—

in the name of the people of Puerto Rico struggling for independence (i.e., the PSP), the solidarity expressed by Mr. Dellums in filing such a resolution in Congress. (Reference to H.J. Res. 1010, *Congressional Record*, July 2, 1976, pp. E-3822 and 3833).

The PSP leader noted:

You know very well that independence for Puerto Rico is a blow against imperialism, and will be a victory for your people as well as us.

Mari outlined the unifying role the PSP's Cuban directed "independence" movement may play for the North American left:

We believe very firmly that active solidarity with the struggle for Puerto Rico independence is already now, and should be in a growing degree, one of the fundamental issues and rallying points of the American left.

And, significantly, the Castroite Communist leader also made it clear that congressional resolutions and legal maneuvers for Puerto Rican "independence" were merely tactics, and that the PSP would continue to organize toward a revolution, asserting:

We are prepared to struggle and fight for Puerto Rican independence and are organizing the Puerto Rican people to affirm unilaterally our right to self-determination without any previous accord of the U.S. Congress.

Again, Juan Mari Bras did not expand on the directions the "struggle" might take. However, he has specifically stated on several occasions that "armed struggle," that is, terrorism, was included on the agenda of possible tactics. Mari's colleague, Florencio Merced, concisely pointed out:

Armed struggle is always the highest form of struggle. This is not to say that armed struggle is always the main form of struggle. The key to the success of the Cuban Revolution is found in the harmonious interrelationship of political mass struggle with the armed struggle of the vanguard and the armed struggle of the people of Cuba.

It was fitting and appropriate that the July 4 coalition rally began with a performance by the Maine Puppet Company, and ended with a severe thunderstorm.

Heavily dominated by the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, a Communist Party directed from Havana, and by pro-Cuban new left groups, the J4C was able to attract several thousand still active members of the most revolutionary segments of the "antiwar" movement of the 1960's. Demonstrators attended from such distant States as Georgia, Florida, Maine, Colorado, Vermont, Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The July 4 Coalition is the result of over a year of organizing involving the Puerto Rican Socialist Party and its supporters in the Weather Underground's Prairie Fire Organizing Committee—PFOC—the Venceremos Brigade, the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee, and its closely allied groups.

First with the organizing of the Hard Times Conference held at the end of January in Chicago, and now with the July 4th demonstration, the Castroites believe that the basis has been created for a new, Cuban-oriented "New Left" political configuration with a Marxist-Leninist ideology and "anti-imperialist" goals.

A meeting of the July 4 Coalition Board preceded the demonstrations at which a continuation committee was created to develop a more permanent form for the J4C during coming months.

In analyzing the significance of the J4C consideration must be given to the range of groups who have accepted political direction in varying degrees from the PSP and who have been able to work together in coalition. They range from Castroite and terrorist support groups such as the PFOC and Venceremos Brigade, through the Mass Party Organizing Committee—MPOC—and the New American Movement—NAM—through small and militant racial minority groups such as the Republic of New Africa and African People's Socialist Party to the terrorism and violence-prone American Indian Movement which is being slowly brought under a semblance of control through the invaluable services of the National Lawyers Guild, the Native American Solidarity Committee, and the Castroites.

The necessity for building a "New Left" Cuban-directed and supported

revolutionary party was made plain at the J4C demonstration. The Soviet-controlled Communist Party, U.S.A., which was among the J4C's earliest sponsors and which remains a major factor in J4C groups such as the Venceremos Brigade, is considered too rigid, hierarchical, and insufficiently militant by the New Left. It is noted that by mid-June, the Communist Party as an organization was pulling out of J4C activities and as the demonstration date drew near, ran articles in its official newspaper, the Daily World, publicizing the People's Bicentennial Commission—PBC—rally in Washington, D.C.

The "New Left" revolutionary party will be designed to fulfill a role analogous to that of the Chilean Socialist Party or of the Spanish Socialist Workers Party—PSOE—more militant and less rigid than the official Communist Party and using Havana as an intermediary with Moscow.

The two main Maoist Communist groups in the U.S.—the October League and the Revolutionary Communist Party—would not work within the J4C. The October League denounced the J4C as "loyal opposition to the ruling class" reflecting the Peking line that both the United States and Russia are "imperialist superpowers" and that denouncer, Cuba as a "lackey of Soviet imperialism." The Revolutionary Communist Party/Rich Off Our Backs group characterized the J4C as "an amalgamation of petit bourgeois opportunist flunkies."

Also opposing the J4C are Trotskyist splinter groups such as the Spartacist League which scorned the J4C as "a motley political bloc of phony revolutionaries, petit bourgeois pacifists, liberal clergymen, ethnic community groups and a handful of bourgeois politicians." For the Sparts, only their own group is revolutionary pure. The largest U.S. Trotskyist group, the Socialist Workers Party, the U.S. section of the Fourth International, had token representatives present selling Militants. Since the SWP clearly cannot control the J4C, they may choose not to work with it at all.

#### SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANDING ON THE MOON

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty special day for all the men and women who have made science and technology in this country outstanding.

It is the seventh anniversary of the landing on the Moon—the greatest feat accomplished by this country in this century.

And, of course, we have landed on Mars. "A stunning accomplishment" according to this morning's newspaper.

I think these two milestones should bring to the attention of our people the fact that science and technology is our last frontier. That a nation that stops growing and does not try to conquer this frontier is going to slowly die.

We need more science—more breakthroughs. We need more people involved in it. It is this type of energy, this type of dedication that will solve many of the problems of this Nation.

I want to pay tribute to the men and women who have worked so hard on these missions and made these missions possible.

**BARABOO NEWS REPUBLIC CALLS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO PROTECT INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM AND PRIVACY**

**HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have long been concerned with the potential power of the Government to invade the privacy of American citizens. While such concern clearly goes back to the founding days of our Republic, as evidenced by the strong safeguards against such Government intrusion provided in our Constitution, our sophisticated technology coupled with the sanctity long granted our intelligence gathering agencies, has created a threat more real than potential.

The chronicle of illegal and questionable activities by our intelligence gathering agencies is long and, by now, well known. Efforts are being made to make certain that we have, in fact, ferreted out all evidence of illegality and to take steps to assure that the Government cannot, and will not, threaten individual freedom and privacy.

The recent exposure of alleged illegal burglaries by the FBI during the past 5 years is a part of our ongoing inquiry into such activities. The Justice Department has undertaken an investigation of the charges that FBI agents disobeyed directives to end burglaries and other illegal actions aimed at left-wing groups. Director Kelley just this past week fired Nicholas Callahan, the No. 2 man at the Bureau. Certainly this must have been a difficult step for Mr. Kelley to take. In the absence of an official explanation for his action, however, we must assume that this step was deemed necessary in the effort to restore the Bureau's integrity.

The question of what more needs to be done, not just with the FBI, but with other arms of the Government which have violated the peoples' rights, remains an open question, but one which must be thoroughly examined and addressed as a top priority issue. The urgency of this matter was recently pointed out in an editorial which appeared in the July 2 edition of the Baraboo, Wis., News Republic. The editorial, which I would like to share with my colleagues, follows:

**THE FBI MUST DESIST**

When will it ever cease? This is the only thought that came to mind when we read recently in the "Los Angeles Times" that "at least 20 FBI agents are under federal investigation for alleged illegal burglaries during the last five years—long after the FBI

CXXII—1447—Part 18

said such so-called black bag jobs ceased. Burglaries were said to have been conducted against groups and individuals the FBI considered "extremists" primarily in the New York area."

In many ways we have great respect for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is an absolutely essential bulwark against perpetrators of federal crimes.

Even more basic than the role of the FBI, however, is the right of every American to feel that his or her home is one's castle and that the government, represented by the FBI, will not burglarize our homes or offices to illegally gain information about our activities.

Equally disturbing is the fact that FBI officials said that former FBI director J. Edgar Hoover, called off black bag jobs in 1966. The existence of much more recent illegal operations by the FBI is likely to raise the question of whether all such actions have really been shut off?

Also disturbing is the fact that the Senate Intelligence Committee which was chaired by Senator Frank Church and recently completed its investigation of illegal activities of American security agencies, apparently was precluded from having information about the FBI breakins.

Meanwhile, a Washington attorney who had been approached to represent the accused agents said that the burglaries were carried out "in the name of security within the scope of their employment, under the direction of their supervisors and without any personal aggrandizement."

Surely, it is time that Americans found out whether or not our basic freedoms to privacy, free speech and free thought are being monitored by the FBI.

It is also time that the Congress took such action as is necessary to stop giving those public employees whom we pay the right to take away our most precious American heritage—freedom and privacy.

**FEDERAL INCOME TAX DEDUCTION TO TENANTS FOR PROPERTY TAXES**

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to allow tenants a tax deduction for that portion of their rent which goes for the payment of property taxes. Tenants deserve to be treated with the same consideration that is given to homeowners and landlords.

For years now, homeowners and landlords have received a Federal tax deduction for their property tax payments. People who live in rented houses or apartments also pay property taxes. The problem is that their portion of those taxes is hidden within their rent payments. Up to 25 percent of a rent charge can in actuality be going to pay the landlord's property tax bill. When property taxes go up for the landlord, the tenant's rent often goes up too. At the present time, however, there is no tax deduction allowed for tenants.

With the high cost of homeownership today, many people, especially city residents, live in rented dwellings. Across the Nation 36 percent of Americans live in rented houses or apartments. In cities

this figure is 50 percent and in some cases the percentage is even higher. These tenants should receive the same tax deduction for their portion of property taxes as is given to the homeowner and landlord. This bill will in no way adversely affect homeowners or landlords.

It is time to correct the tax code to remove an inequity that penalizes a large segment of our population.

**REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FOR OLDER AMERICANS, "SENIOR TRANSPORTATION: TICKET TO DIGNITY," NOW AVAILABLE TO MEMBERS AND THE PUBLIC**

**HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to Members of the House that copies are now available of the report, "Senior Transportation: Ticket to Dignity," which the Select Committee on Aging approved at its last meeting.

The report was prepared by the select committee's Subcommittee on Federal, State, and Community Services, which I am privileged to chair.

The report is about transportation for older Americans. The subcommittee makes a total of nine recommendations on steps to be taken to give senior citizens that all-important "ticket to dignity."

Mr. Speaker, the subject of transportation is one that was, in a way, thrust upon my subcommittee. No matter where we scheduled field hearings, no matter what the announced agenda, witnesses testified time after time about the crying need for transportation services for the elderly in their respective areas.

And so the Subcommittee on Federal, State, and Community Services began a more formal inquiry into the transportation difficulties being experienced by older Americans, and how best to deal with them. Hearings were held in Washington, in California, in New Jersey, and in Connecticut. In those hearings alone, some 57 witnesses testified, and dozens of statements were submitted for the record. These totals do not include the witnesses who talked about transportation at hearings not focused on transportation. In Iowa, in Nevada, in Los Angeles, in Alabama, in Hawaii, in Pennsylvania, older people themselves and those who serve them pleaded with the committee to deal with the acute mobility problems.

We have had the benefit, Mr. Speaker, of the counsel and advice of one of the most prominent transportation economists in America, Joseph Revis. Mr. Revis, who was the author of the so-called "state-of-the-art" report submitted to Congress by the Administration on Aging, served as a consultant to the subcommittee in putting together the report we are considering.



The basic dimensions of the problems are set forth in the first section of the report, and the second section lists most of the major Federal programs that fund transportation services to the elderly. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that that section itself will be a useful tool for people in the field trying to find out what is available from the Federal Government to help transport the elderly.

The third section—the longest section—describes the gaps in service that remain despite the programs described earlier. Finally, there is a series of recommendations. The recommendations call for actions by the Congress, the executive branch, and State and local governments.

#### MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

First. Perhaps the most obvious deficiency in the present situation is the duplication of effort and lack of coordination among the various agencies, at all levels, dealing with transportation for the elderly. Almost all social service agencies spend money on transportation, and almost all of them ignore other organizations with similar programs. One witness from Rhode Island, who runs a statewide transportation system for the elderly, identified 375 different agencies that had money available to pay for transporting the elderly.

This example is closer to being the rule, rather than the exception. The report recommends that Congress require coordination in new programs it enacts, or old ones it reenacts. We recommend that the President cut through redtape and issue waivers of regulations to permit pooling and coordination. We recommend that social service agencies be required to go to their local transit agencies before setting up their own insulated transportation system consisting of a van or two.

Second. The other major focus of our report is in the area of funding. There are several aspects to the problem.

One is that Federal funding tends to be temporary. Projects are started but cannot be continued, and the people served for a short time are so disappointed that the last state of the population is worse than the first. Federal funds are also skewed toward capital expenses—buying the buses and equipment—rather than toward running the system after the equipment has been provided. Yet the subcommittee found that 80 to 90 percent of total project costs go to operating, rather than capital, expenses. This is particularly true in rural areas, where distances are farther and population less dense.

Our report recommends that Federal funding emphasis be shifted more toward operation, rather than capital purchases, and calls on the Public Works and Transportation Committee to examine very closely the implications of such a shift on the need for increased appropriations.

One last major recommendation I would like to note especially for the committee this morning has to do with a group of older people we refer to in our report as the "not-poor-enough" elderly. There are 3 million Americans aged 65 or older with incomes under the poverty level. Where there are special Federal

transportation programs, these people can take advantage of them. But there are another 4 million older Americans with incomes of between \$3,000 and \$5,000—too poor to purchase the transportation services they need in the marketplace, but too "rich" to qualify for the special systems in existence for the poorer elderly.

We recommend that the elderly be exempted from social services "means tests" except where absolutely necessary.

There are other important recommendations in the report, but in the interest of brevity I commend to Members of the House not only the report, but the eight-page summary, reprinted at the beginning of the report, which sets out the fundamental findings and recommendations of my subcommittee in an easily readable fashion.

I must say a word, Mr. Speaker, about the fine cooperation I have received from the minority members of my subcommittee, particularly the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California (Mr. Wilson). He has supported me in every important initiative I have undertaken over the last year as chairman, and that support was particularly noteworthy in the production of this report. I want to take this opportunity to thank and commend him.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a note of urgency. At the 1971 White House Conference on Aging, the report on transportation noted that "the transportation needs of the elderly cannot wait for more studies. Immediate action is needed." In the 5 years since that report was issued, one-third of the older Americans alive at the time have died. There is no time to waste, Mr. Speaker, and I truly believe that the steps we recommend represent a healthy beginning in meeting the acute mobility needs of older Americans today.

#### LATE PARLIAMENTARIAN LEWIS DESCHLER

#### HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly share the sentiments which you have already expressed to the House regarding our former and late Parliamentarian Lewis Deschler.

Lewis Deschler served the House of Representatives as Parliamentarian an unprecedented 46 years gaining recognition as an expert in parliamentary procedure the world over. I am confident his new book of Rules of Procedure will be used as a basic text of parliamentary law for years to come, and am certain that Lew Deschler will long be remembered as the greatest Parliamentarian in the history of the House of Representatives.

It was, therefore, my own pleasure and good fortune to have been able to serve in the House while Lew Deschler served as House Parliamentarian. His passing is a great loss, and his family has my sincere sympathy.

#### NATIONAL POWER GRID

#### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, last April 29, I filed a bill (H.R. 13451) which would create a national power grid corporation for the purpose of equalizing our Nation's regional bulk electric power distribution. This measure would obviate the need for any utility's building unnecessary levels of power capacity in order to meet peak load demands in our densely populated urban areas. Rather, electrical power could be shipped in bulk from any point in the Nation to meet the increased needs as they arise. As a result of the national power grid, our electrical energy capacity could be used more fully, at a greater constant percentage of its potential. This would save the cost of unused peak capacity and the electrical energy consumer would be getting more for his/her dollar.

Recently, this concept has met with increasing acceptance from several major energy networks. Actual facilities are now being constructed to facilitate the development of a national power grid. This type of grassroots, national support is reflected in the following article, which I now offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as written by Mr. Reginald Stuart in the New York Times and published on May 25, 1976:

#### PROJECT IS MOVING NATIONAL POWER GRID NEAR REALITY

(By Reginald Stuart)

Special to The New York Times

STEGALL, NEBR.—The establishment of a nationwide electric power grid is moving closer as construction here nears completion on the first permanent tie between the huge Eastern and Western power grids.

At present, both grids terminate in this isolated southern Nebraska community. The towers of each are separated by only a few hundred yards of wheatfields and a narrow, lightly traveled road. The power networks covering the Eastern and Western parts of the nation meet at a point about 200 miles east of the Continental Divide.

Once completed, the tie—a transmission station—will enable utilities in this region to make routine exchanges of small amounts of power between the grids, just as utilities in other parts of the nation do within the same grid on a larger scale. The link is scheduled to be completed in October.

Although it is the lone project of its type linking the Eastern and Western power networks, and a small one at that, the transmission facility could be viewed as a first step to development of a full-scale high-capacity power East-West grid capable of transmitting vast amounts of power from huge generators for consumption in areas hundreds of miles away.

In recent years there has been considerable debate over the merits of such a grid. A study on the subject by the Congressional Research Service was recently released by the Senate subcommittee on minerals, materials and fuels.

"Some people might say this facility is like the first bridge across the Mississippi," said Wendell J. Garwood, executive vice president of the Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, the rural wholesale power cooperative that is building the facility to meet the growing demand for electricity in its three-state service area.

"That bridge is probably long since gone, but succeeded by more and better ones."

Tri-State, organized in 1952 to plan action to meet the power needs of the area, serves 25 rural electrical cooperatives in Colorado, Wyoming and Nebraska.

The \$13-million transmission link will have an average capacity of 100 megawatts, small when compared to the 500,000-megawatt transmission capacity of the nation's entire electric power system.

Designed by the General Electric Company, it is part of a larger project that will enable Tri-State to buy power from the Basin Electric Power Cooperative, which operates in eight states—Montana, Nebraska, Wyoming, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota and Iowa. The Basin Cooperative is building a \$1.3 billion 1,500 megawatt coal-fired power plant in Wheatland, Wyo., the major part of the project.

The link consists of two solid-state converters, each of which will include two 25-kilovolt, 2,000-ampere valve assemblies that will convert alternating current to direct current, then back to alternating current.

Power exchanges between electric utilities have been commonplace in much of the industry for several decades, particularly in densely populated areas. However, in sparsely populated areas with little industry, ties have been temporary or nonexistent.

#### NEW YORK BLACKOUT RECALLED

Increased emphasis on interconnection of utilities for meeting emergency power needs and strengthening reliability followed the devastating New York blackout in the fall of 1965.

#### PLANNERS BUSY

"Planning on a systematic basis was enhanced and systems began to beef up their connections," said W. Donham Crawford, president of the Edison Electric Institute, the trade association of investor-owned electric utilities.

Although smaller ties such as the one nearing completion are likely to be the extent of East-West grid connections in the near future, the possibility of high-capacity links is attracting increasing interest.

Although the economists are the subject of considerable debate, the Congressional Research Service study found that there was no long-term barriers to the "successful operation of a strong, high-capacity, fully coordinated national power network," although the technology to enable this is still uncertain.

"We expect the national grid to evolve whether or not a deliberate effort is made to accelerate its development," the report said.

The Edison Institute is opposed to a new high-capacity system, arguing that the "alleged benefits" of a high-capacity network "are already provided" by existing electric power systems. Numerous other groups, especially public power systems, have disagreed.

#### PERSONAL STATEMENT

### HON. MARTHA KEYS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mrs. KEYS. Mr. Speaker, one of my campaign promises was to record a position on those votes for which I was unavoidably absent. I have fulfilled that promise. However, not all of my positions on those votes for which I was absent are recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order that the official record have an

account of my positions, I hereby insert the votes I would have cast had I been present:

#### FIRST SESSION

Rollcall No. 53, "aye."  
Rollcall No. 299, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 329, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 361, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 477, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 478, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 479, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 587, "no."  
Rollcall No. 674, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 701, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 702, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 715, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 722, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 723, "yea."  
Rollcall No. 724, "yea."

#### SECOND SESSION

Rollcall No. 68, "yea."

#### THWARTING THE NATIONAL WILL

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the President has once again demonstrated his power to strike down important pieces of legislation passed overwhelmingly by the Congress. S. 3201, the public works employment bill, can now be added to the truly impressive list of social legislation which, by means of the veto, he has forced the Congress to pare almost beyond recognition or abandon completely. Americans who seek jobs, improved day care facilities, or better housing all have been victimized by the President's actions. Mr. Ford's reasoning is simple, but flawed. Social programs, he claims, are inflationary; but why the \$8 billion proposed increase in defense spending is not, remains unexplained.

Contrary to the intent of the framers of our Constitution, Mr. Ford clearly has used the veto to thwart the legislative initiatives of the Congress and impose his own social and political philosophy on the legislative branch. Senate majority leader MANSFIELD put it most succinctly when he said:

The veto was intended by the Founding Fathers to afford the Chief Executive the authority to prevent an unconstitutional action by the legislative branch of government. It was not intended by the Founding Fathers to give the Chief Executive's personal viewpoints on policy a prevailing judgment over the elected legislature.

I am pleased to insert into today's RECORD a thoughtful article by the president of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, Mr. I. W. Abel. Its message is particularly relevant in light of the veto of S. 3201, despite pressure from Democrats and Republicans alike. The only way for the Congress to reassert itself in this unfortunate battle with the executive branch is to exercise its power to override. I hope that we do precisely that when S. 3201 comes before us.

Mr. Abel's words follow:

THWARTING THE NATIONAL WILL: PRESIDENT FORD IS MISUSING THE VETO

(By I. W. Abel, President, Industrial Union Department)

With mounting dismay, we have watched the Ford Administration follow in its predecessor's footsteps, misusing the power of the presidential veto to impose a form of minority rule on the United States.

President Ford, the first to reach that office without national election, has almost routinely used the veto to stymie passage—by an elected Congress—of legislation urgently needed to restore economic and social progress to the nation. By following the Nixon lead in frustrating the will of the elected majority, President Ford has ignored the precedents of our history; traditionally the veto has been a careful instrument unsheathed mainly to prevent unfair concessions to special interest or to defend constitutional issues.

In President Ford's hands, the veto has changed from a constitutional defensive sword to a club used to smash efforts of the majority to solve the delicate social and economic problems of the day. In this issue of Viewpoint, we take a careful look at the effects of the Ford vetoes on some of these major issues. Efforts to return the unemployed to work, to alleviate the problems of the sick and the poor, to reinvigorate key sections of the economy, and to come to grips with energy-related problems have fallen victim to the veto.

It is obvious that the Nixon-Ford veto record must be condemned on two counts. One is that the White House must be occupied by a President dedicated to the use of constitutional powers in their proper manner and to the benefit of our country and its democratic ideals. The other is that the continuing damage to our social fabric caused by this outpouring of vetoes must be corrected at once.

#### TRIBUTE TO PHILIP E. HOWARD

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the tragic and untimely death of Gene Howard over the congressional recess. Since 1968 Gene had been a member of the staff of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and all of us who serve on the committee have come to depend on his keen perception of veterans needs and problems and his wise counsel and sound judgment in formulating solutions to those problems.

Gene's life was dedicated to the service of veterans and their families. An Army veteran of World War II, he became actively involved in Amvets upon his release from the service. His considerable talents and devotion to duty were soon recognized by this fine veterans organization and he eventually rose to the position of executive director of Amvets—a position in which he served from 1956 to 1962.

With an outstanding record of achievements for Amvets and for veterans throughout the country, Gene gained a reputation in veterans circles as a man who could get the job done. In



1964 he became special assistant to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, William J. Driver. In his 4 years in this position, Gene worked closely with President Lyndon Johnson, with the Congress, and particularly with those of us on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Again, his commitment to improving the system of these services to veterans is evidenced by a solid record of accomplishments.

Gene became a member of the staff of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in 1968. I know that in the years I had the good fortune of working with him, I always found him helpful, dependable, and totally dedicated to the cause of veterans. He will be deeply missed. My profound sympathy goes out to his wife and family.

#### ENERGY SUPPLY—THE SOMETIME PROBLEM

### HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, when the oil embargo went into effect, everyone felt the pinch and there was much flurry and fuss about energy supply. But the embargo eventually ended and things returned to normal—albeit at a higher price. We have made some progress, but largely it is "consume" as usual for the average citizen. The end of the gasoline line was the end of the crisis in the minds of most.

The promise of great new energy sources is a second factor which has contributed to present complacency about energy.

But what we are missing here is the big picture—we are missing the fact that our oil supplies are coming more and more from sources outside our control—and we are missing the fact that the new energy sources are promises only for now. They will not come on line in significant quantity until well into the next century.

In the meantime, we must address the energy situation of the next few decades. I am not talking about an all-out growth policy or even a policy of energy independence. I am talking about getting people where they want to go and keeping the refrigerator running back home.

An official of the Energy Research and Development Administration who has done more than most to promote and advance the cause of new and alternative energy sources spoke to this problem recently. He is Dr. Robert L. Hirsch and I would like to reprint his statement as it appeared in the June 11 Baltimore Sun. The article follows:

ENERGY AIDE SAYS UNITED STATES IGNORES "CRISIS;" PREDICTS NEW GAS LINES, FACTORY CLOSINGS

(By Albert Sehlstedt, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—A federal energy official said yesterday the nation may be heading toward another energy crisis with factory closings and long gasoline lines at some unspecified time in the future.

"We are kind of headed now toward letting ourselves slide into a crisis situation with gas lines and plant shutdowns," said Dr. Robert L. Hirsch, of the Energy Research and Development Administration.

Dr. Hirsch blamed part of the problem on what he said was people's refusal to believe there is a genuine energy problem in this country.

"We have a crisis because we have a problem people don't believe in," he said in the course of a press conference at the agency's offices here.

The meeting was called to review the Energy Research and Development Administration's endeavors to develop alternate sources of power. Dr. Hirsch is assistant administrator for solar, geothermal and advanced energy systems in the agency.

His concerns have been expressed in recent weeks by other people in and out of government as the nation increases its dependence on imported petroleum products. Domestic oil production is now in its sixth year of decline.

One indicator of public complacency about energy has been recent reports that people are turning again to larger automobiles.

Asked to comment on this trend, Dr. Hirsch said: "I'm very saddened by the fact that people are going back to big cars," adding that these vehicles now being bought will consume "a lot of fuel for a lot of years."

In a discussion of alternate sources of energy, Dr. Hirsch said he was encouraged by California voters' rejection of a state referendum that would have placed new restrictions on the development of new nuclear power plants.

"In the near term, we have to depend on things here and now and fission [energy obtained from splitting an atom] is here now," he said.

"I'm pleased to see that people voted it down," he said of the California referendum.

Asked when solar energy might begin to play a significant role in the nation's energy production, he said he did not know, adding that the cost of producing it cheaply was a major problem.

Dr. Hirsch speculated that as oil and natural gas become increasingly scarce their prices will go up. In the meantime, the cost of solar energy may start coming down and, at some point in the future, the two costs may meet.

He said he thought that public utilities would get involved in solar energy applications as research and development continued, and he rejected the notion that these companies were dragging their feet in the search for practical alternatives to gas and oil.

"I haven't found any of that and I've talked to a hell of a lot of these guys," he said, observing that many people in public utilities are looking for a solution to energy shortages from any source.

Dr. Hirsch, who earned his Ph.D. in physics at the University of Illinois in 1964, has been in his present position at the Energy Research and Development Administration since March of this year. He has devoted a large part of his career to fusion research which is aimed at garnering the energy of the atom by joining nuclei of elements rather than splitting them.

Pollution-free fusion power is one of the most promising avenues to energy self-sufficiency for the entire world but the extraordinarily complex nature of the science suggests that it is decades away from realization.

#### ELEVENTH ANNUAL NATIONAL SAILING MATCH CHAMPIONSHIPS

### HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to your atten-

tion a most exciting sailing event which is taking place in California.

During the week of August 23 through August 27, the California Yacht Club, one of the most highly respected on the west coast, will host a series of match races to determine the national champion in the 11th Annual National Sailing Match Racing Championships.

Competing in the match will be the eight area champions. The Prince of Wales Bowl, symbolic of the national champion is at stake in this U.S. Yacht Racing Union sponsored event.

The California Yacht Club is pleased that Marina del Rey, the world's largest manmade marina, has been chosen as the site for the race. Course of the race will be triangular, windward-leeward between Marina del Rey and Santa Monica, at least 6 miles in length.

It is a great pleasure to extend a warm welcome to the competitors and the members of the U.S. Yacht Racing Union.

#### THE PRESIDENT AT MONTICELLO

### HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a significant address by the President which it was my privilege to hear on July 5, 1976, at naturalization ceremonies held at Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson, near Charlottesville, Va., as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE NATURALIZATION CEREMONY AT MONTICELLO

Congressman Robinson, Governor Godwin, Mr. Justice Powell, Senator Byrd, Ambassador Nolting, Reverend Clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a very great honor and a high privilege, Governor Godwin, to come to the Commonwealth of Virginia and to this beautiful and significant home and to participate in this wonderful ceremony. It is a great honor and privilege for me to be here today.

I am very proud to welcome all of you as fellow citizens of the United States of America. I invite you to join fully in the American adventure and to share our common goal and our common glory.

Our common goal is freedom—the liberty of each individual to enjoy the equal rights and to pursue the happiness which in this life God gives and self-government secures.

Our common glory is the great heritage from the past which enriches the present and insures our future.

In 1884, France, as a birthday gift, presented the United States with a statue—the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. This year scores of friendly nations have sent us Bicentennial gifts which we deeply appreciate and will long cherish.

But you have given us a birthday present beyond price—yourselves, your faith, your loyalty, and your love. We thank you with full and friendly hearts.

After two centuries, there is still something wonderful about being an American. If we cannot quite express it, we know what it is. You know what it is or you would not be here today. Why not just call it patriotism?

Thomas Jefferson was a Virginia planter, a politician, a philosopher, a practical prob-

lem-solver, a Palladian architect, a poet in prose. With such genius he became a Burgess, a delegate, a Governor, an Ambassador, a Secretary of State, a Vice President, and President of the United States. But, he was first a patriot.

The American patriots of 1776 who pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to declare and defend our independence did more than dissolve their ties with another country to protest against the abuses of their liberties.

Jefferson and his colleagues very deliberately and very daringly set out to construct a new kind of nation. "Men may be trusted," he said, "to govern themselves without a master." This was the most revolutionary idea in the world at that time. It remains the most revolutionary idea in the world today.

Washington, Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and all patriots who laid the foundation for freedom in our Declaration and our Constitution carefully studied both contemporary and classic models of Government to adapt them to the American climate and our circumstances.

Just as Jefferson did in designing Monticello, they wanted to build in this beautiful land a home for equal freedom and opportunity, a haven of safety and happiness, not for themselves alone, but for all who would come to us through centuries.

How well they built is told by millions upon millions who came and are still coming. Our first national census in 1790 produced a recorded population just under four million. Three-fourths of them traced their ancestry to the British Isles, though most had considered themselves Americans for several generations.

There was already talk about further immigration, proposing it should be selective and restrictive, but this was swept aside by the greatest mass movement of people in all human history.

Immigrants came from almost everywhere, singly and in waves. Throughout our first century they brought the restless drive for better lives and rugged strength that cleared the wilderness, plowed the prairie, tamed the western plains, pushing on into the Pacific and to Alaska.

Like the Mayflower Pilgrims and the early Spanish settlers, these new Americans brought with them precious relics of the worlds they left behind—a song, a story, a dance, a tool, a seed, a recipe, the name of a place, the rules of a game, a trick of the trade.

Such transfusions of traditions and cultures, as well as of blood, have made Americans unique among nations and Americans a new kind of people. There is little the world has that is not native to the United States today. Unfettered by ancient hates, the people of the young United States really believed that all men are created equal.

We admit they had stubborn blind spots in their lofty vision—for blacks, whose forebear had been Americans almost as long as theirs—and for women, whose political rights we took even longer to recognize.

This is not the day, however, to deplore our shortcomings or to regret that not all new citizens have been welcomed as you are here today. The essential fact is that the United States—as a national policy and in the hearts of most Americans—has been willing to absorb anyone from anywhere.

We were confident that simply by sharing our American adventure these newcomers would become loyal, law-abiding, productive citizens, and they did. Older nations in the 18th and 19th centuries granted their nationality to foreign born only as a special privilege, if at all. We offered citizenship to all, and we have been richly rewarded.

The United States was able to do this because we are uniquely a community of values as distinct from a religious community, a racial community, a geographic community or an ethnic community. This nation was founded 200 years ago, not on ancient legends or conquests or physical likeness or language, but on a certain political value which Jefferson's pen so eloquently expressed.

To be an American is to subscribe to those opinions which the Declaration of Independence proclaims and the Constitution protects: The political values of self-government, liberty and justice, equal rights and equal opportunity.

These beliefs are the secrets of America's unity from diversity—in my judgment the most magnificent achievement of our 200 years as a nation. "Black is beautiful" was a motto of genius which uplifted us far above its intention. Once Americans had thought about it and perceived its truth, we began to realize that so are brown, white, red and yellow beautiful. When I was young, a Sunday school teacher told us that the beauty of Joseph's coat was in its many colors. I believe Americans are beautiful—individually, in communities, and freely joined together, by dedication to the United States of America.

I see a growing danger in this country to conformity of thought and taste and behavior. We need more encouragement and protection for individuality. The wealth we have of culture, ethnic and religious and racial traditions, are valuable counterbalances to the overpowering sameness and subordination of totalitarian societies.

The sense of belonging to any group that stands for something decent and noble so long as it does not confine free spirits or cultivate hostility to others, is part of the pride every American should have in the heritage of the past.

That heritage is rooted now, not in England alone—as indebted as we are for the Magna Carta and the Common Law—not in Europe alone, or in Africa alone, or Asia or on the islands of the sea. The American adventure draws from the best of all of mankind's long sojourn here on Earth and now reaches out into the solar system.

You came as strangers among us and you leave here as citizens, equal in fundamental rights, equal before the law with an equal share in the promise of the future.

Jefferson did not define what the pursuit of happiness means for you or for me. Our Constitution does not guarantee that any of us will find it. But we are free to try.

Foreigners like Lafayette, Von Steuben and Pulaski came to fight in our Revolution because they believed in its principles that they felt were universal. Immigrants like Andrew Carnegie came as a poor boy and created a great steel industry, then gave his fortune back to America for libraries, universities and museums. Maria Francesca Cabrini came as a missionary Sister to serve the sick and the poor. Samuel Gompers worked in a sweatshop, spent his lunchtime helping other immigrant workers learn to read so they could become citizens. We have gained far, far more than we have given to the millions who made America their second homeland.

Remember that none of us are more than caretakers of this great country. Remember that the more freedom you give to others, the more you will have for yourself. Remember that without law there can be no liberty.

And remember, as well, the rich treasures you brought from whence you came, and let us share your pride in them.

This is the way that we keep our independence as exciting as the day it was declared and keep the United States of America even more beautiful than Joseph's coat.

Thank you very much.

## FEDERAL SERVICE CAMPAIGN FOR NATIONAL HEALTH AGENCIES' GREAT SUCCESS IN ILLINOIS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, a large portion of research and development, educational and preventive programs and patient services offered to the public are done through not-for-profit health organizations, with the majority of their support derived through public dollars. Richard Lockhart, of the National Health Agencies in Illinois has asked me to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress and the public his organizations' appreciation and thanks for this public support.

Mr. Lockhart serves as the coordinator for 14 National Health Agencies in Illinois, and as such, is well acquainted with the Federal Government's cooperation and support for these agencies.

A variety of health and social service organizations have been authorized by the Federal Government to solicit funds at Federal civilian and military installations across the country. This campaign is conducted on a once-a-year basis, and allows for contributor gifts through payroll deduction. In Illinois, the results from the last campaign indicate the most successful fund-raising drive to date. The Federal employees in this campaign pledged an overall total of \$1,890,132; of this the Health Agencies will receive \$494,559. The remainder is shared by the local United Way Organizations and the International Service Agencies.

Mr. Lockhart informs me that in addition to the outstanding support given the campaign by the Federal civilian and military personnel, special thanks are in order to those Federal executives who served as campaign chairmen. These gentlemen gave selflessly of their time and talent and as the figures indicate they have been most successful.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all Federal civilian and military employees for their generous support and, in particular, the following gentlemen who served as Combined Federal Campaign chairmen in Illinois:

### COMBINED FEDERAL CAMPAIGN CHAIRMEN OF ILLINOIS

Mr. Ernest Bickhaus, Adams County CFC, U.S. Post Office, Quincy, Illinois 62301.

Mr. Frank Yost, Alton Area CFC, U.S. Post Office, Godfrey, Illinois 62035.

Mr. Michael Van Boekel, Aurora Area CFC, Air Route Traffic Control Center, Aurora, Illinois 60504.

Captain David Hall, Belle-Scott CFC, U.S. Air Force, Scott AFB, Illinois.

Mr. Arlen Dahlman, Carroll County CFC, Savanna Army Depot, Savanna, Illinois 60174.

Colonel T. H. Yashuhara, Champaign County CFC, Chanut Technical Training Center, Chanut AFB 61866.

Mr. Clarence Gels, Cook-DuPage CFC, U.S. Post Office, Chicago, Illinois 60607.

Mr. George Beckwith, Elgin Area CFC, U.S. Post Office, Elgin, Illinois 60120.

Mr. Boyd Holmes, Jefferson County CFC,



Social Security Administration, Mt. Vernon, Illinois 62864.

Mr. Clark McKenna, Kankakee County CFC, U.S. Post Office, Kankakee, Illinois 60901.

Mr. Bill Tipsword, Knox County CFC, Social Security Administration, Galesburg, Illinois 61401.

Captain Almon Wilson, Lake County CFC, Naval Regional Medical Center, Great Lakes, IL 60088.

Mr. Joseph Zandecki, LaSalle-Peru Area CFC, U.S. Post Office, LaSalle, Illinois.

Mr. Robert Buhrke, McLean County CFC, U.S. Post Office, Bloomington, Illinois.

Mr. Gerald Boyle, Macon County CFC, Social Security Admin., Decatur, Illinois 62525.

Lt. Col. Robert Cranston, Madison County CFC, U.S. Army, Granite City, IL 62040.

Mr. Emmett Russell, Peoria County CFC, U.S. Post Office, Peoria, Illinois 61601.

Mr. Patrick Klein, Rock Island County CFC, U.S. Army Command Hdqts., Rock Island, Illinois 61201.

Mr. Boyd Barton, Sangamon County CFC, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, Springfield, Illinois.

Mr. B. J. Tolson, Williamson County CFC, U.S. Penitentiary, Marion, Illinois 62959.

Mr. Ken Blue, Vermillion County CFC, U.S. Post Office, Danville, Illinois.

Mr. Robert Juricic, Will County CFC, U.S. Post Office, Joliet, IL 60431.

Mr. Al Mera, Winnebago County CFC, U.S. Post Office, Rockford, IL 61125.

#### ZION EPISCOPAL CHURCH, DOUGLSTON, N.Y.

#### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in this year of our country's Bicentennial celebration, I think it is fitting to commend a religious institution that has been serving its community for nearly 150 years. On Sunday, June 27, I had the pleasure of attending morning prayer at the Zion Episcopal Church in Douglaston, N.Y., where the rector, Rev. Rex L. Burrell, is ably following in the tradition of community leadership established by his many outstanding predecessors.

Reverend Burrell, an Australian, delivered a service in the form of an Australian thanksgiving for the United States of America. He pointed out that Australia was settled in 1788 largely because of America's independence, and that because Great Britain learned from her American experience she granted self-government to the six colonies of Australia when the desire for it became apparent. The U.S. Constitution served as a model for the Australian Federalists in 1901, and the Australians are thankful that their alliances with the United States in the two World Wars have brought our countries closer in friendship.

The Australian Consul-General in New York, Mr. Peter Barbour also read a lesson at this fine service honoring our Nation's Bicentennial.

I congratulate Reverend Burrell and the members of the Zion Episcopal Church for the service they have provided for their community and am confident that they will continue to do a fine job in the future.

#### PRESIDENT FORD'S BICENTENNIAL MESSAGES

#### HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, July 4, 1976 was a great day for all Americans, and I am particularly pleased that Valley Forge Park was President Ford's first Bicentennial stop.

Although his visit was planned months in advance in connection with the Wagon Train Celebration, House and Senate passage last month of H.R. 5621 permitted a timely and appropriate setting for signature of Public Law 94-337 to provide for the establishment of the Valley Forge National Historical Park in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

President Ford's remarks at Valley Forge Park and at Independence Hall set the tone for an experience we will always remember—a truly memorable and meaningful Bicentennial Day. The President's remarks follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

July 4, 1976.

#### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT VALLEY FORGE STATE PARK

Governor Shapp, Senator Scott, Senator Schweiker, Governor Ray, Congressman Schulze, Lieutenant Governor Klein, Secretary Kleppe, Administrator Warner, Reverend Clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

Governor Shapp, I am deeply grateful for your very kind and generous remarks. The sun always shines in Pennsylvania. (Laughter).

They came here in the snows of winter over a trail marked with the blood of the rag-bound feet. The iron forge that gave this place its name had been destroyed by the British when General Washington and his ragged Continental Army encamped here—exhausted, outnumbered and short of everything except faith.

We gather here today, the 200th anniversary of our independence, to commemorate their sacrifices even before we celebrate the glorious Declaration. Americans will remember the name of Valley Forge as long as the spirit of sacrifice lives within their hearts.

Here the vein of iron in our national character was forged. In the 18th century the Colonial American was far more free and far more prosperous than his European cousins. Englishmen regarded us with some envy as appropriate subjects to share their grinding tax burden.

After Concord Bridge and Breed's Hill, the British Generals were impressed with our marksmanship and fighting spirit, but they still dismissed Washington's militiamen as a rabble of arms.

Many years later, when he was 91, a veteran of Concord was interviewed and asked why he took up his rifle against his King. Did he feel intolerably oppressed? "No, never paid a penny for one of them stamps, never drank any tea, never heard of Locke. Only read the Bible and the Almanac."

Well, then, what did all the fighting mean? "Young man," the aging Revolutionary said very firmly, "What we meant in going for those Redcoats was this—we had always governed ourselves, and we always meant to. They didn't mean that we should."

Without Jefferson's eloquence, those are the words of the American people's Declaration of Independence. That was the straight talk that brought some 11,000 ordinary Americans—farmers, workers, tradesmen and

shopkeepers—into this valley of sacrifice in the bitter winter of 1777. Uncounted hundreds were never to leave.

They did not die amid the banners and the tearful sound of battle. They weakened slowly and quietly succumbed to cold, sickness and starvation. Yet, their courage and suffering—those who survived as well those who fell—were no less meaningful than the sacrifices of those who manned the battlements of Boston and scaled the parapets of Yorktown.

In the battle against despair, Washington and his men kept freedom's lonely vigil. The leadership and the led drew strength and hope from one another. Around the winter campfires that dotted those fields, the flame of liberty was somehow kept burning.

Something happened at Valley Forge. That ragged, starving Army here emerged in a way that can be sensed but never fully described. They suffered, they trained, they toughened, they buried their dead and they stayed. They stuck it out.

When spring melted the snows and green returned to this beautiful countryside, a proud and disciplined fighting force marched out of this valley to victory and to the pages of history, unaware of the greatness they had done and oblivious of our gratitude.

As Abraham Lincoln noted long afterwards at another sacred site in Pennsylvania, nothing we can say here today can further consecrate or hallow this ground. But, we can rededicate ourselves to the spirit of sacrifice shown at Valley Forge, Gettysburg, the Argonne Forest, Anzio Beach and Iwo Jima.

Not all sacrifices are made in war. There are always sacrifices of peace. The sturdy wagon trains that have returned here, the wonderful people who drove them and those along the way who rededicated themselves to the great principles of the Declaration of Independence, offer heartwarming proof that our American adventure has just begun.

Our Bicentennial is the happy birthday of all 50 States, the commonwealth and self-governing territories. It is not just a celebration for the original 13 colonies. Americans are one people, and we can still hear them saying "We have always governed ourselves, and we always mean to."

The earliest English settlers carried the Bible and Blackstone's Commentary across the Atlantic among their few cherished possessions and established their own self-government on a strange and hostile coast. American families in prairie schoolers like these took with them on the overland trails the principles of equality and their God-given rights of the Declaration of Independence.

Their restless search for a better life was begun in the spirit of adventure, but it was the spirit of sacrifice that sustained them. They suffered cruel winters, savage attacks, blazing deserts and bloody feet.

Many were buried beside the trail, but many stuck it out, dug in and built permanent settlements where women stood the same sentry duty as the men.

In the West, the Declaration's promise of legal and political equality for women was first broadened. The American pioneers knew that in their wilderness homes they could not be colonials ruled by a distant Government. They had assurance that in due course they could govern themselves as full citizens of equal States.

Their children and future generations would have all the rights of Washington, Jackson and Lincoln. So do we, and more so.

As we continue our American adventure, the patriots of Valley Forge and the pioneers of the American frontier—indeed, all our heroes and heroines of war and peace—send us this single, urgent message—though prosperity is a good thing, though compassionate charity is a good thing, though institutional reform is a good thing, a nation survives only so long as the spirit of sacrifice and self-discipline is strong within its people.

Independence has to be defended as well as declared. Freedom is always worth fighting for, and liberty ultimately belongs to those willing to suffer for it.

If we remember this, we can bring health where there is disease, peace where there is strife, progress where there is poverty and want, and when our Tricentennial celebration rolls around 100 years from now, grateful Americans will come to this shrine of quiet valor, this forge of our Republic iron core.

Thank you very much.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
July 4, 1976.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING  
H.R. 5621

VALLEY FORGE STATE PARK

Governor Shapp, Senator Scott, Senator Schweiker, Congressman Schulze, Secretary Kleppe, distinguished guests:

This is a great privilege for me, to sign this very important bill on George Washington's desk. I am deeply grateful because of the strong Congressional support. Over a long period of years, Senator Scott, Senator Schweiker, Congressman Schulze and many others took the lead and the net result is that under this legislation the Federal Government will take over this historic site and it will be known as the Valley Forge National Historic Park.

It will be a great tribute to those I mentioned in my remarks and those who gave so much, and the sacrifices they made.

So, I congratulate you, Scott, I congratulate the other Members of the House and Senate who did such a fine job in making this signing possible.

Governor, we are delighted to take over and make certain that the good work of the State of Pennsylvania is carried on and that this historic site will become another in the complex of national historic sites for the preservation of those things that mean so much to us, those sites that contribute so significantly to our national history and our national progress.

Thank you very much.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
July 4, 1976.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT INDEPENDENCE  
HALL

Charlton Heston, Mayor Rizzo, Governor Shapp, Reverend Clergy, distinguished Members of Congress, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

On Washington's Birthday in 1861, a fortnight after six States had formed a Confederacy of their own, Abraham Lincoln came here to Independence Hall knowing that in ten days he would face the cruelest national crisis of our 85-year history.

"I am filled with deep emotion," he said, "at finding myself standing here in the place where collected together the wisdom, the patriotism, the devotion to principle, from which sprang the institutions under which we live."

Today, we can all share these simple noble sentiments. Like Lincoln, I feel both pride and humility, rejoicing in reverence as I stand in the place where two centuries ago the United States of America was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

From this small but beautiful building, then the most imposing structure in the Colonies, came the two great documents that continue to supply the moral and intellectual power for the American adventure in self-government.

Before me is the great bronze bell that joyously rang out the news of the birth of our Nation from the steeple of the State

House. It was never intended to be a church bell. Yet, a generation before the great events of 1776, the elected assembly of Pennsylvania ordered it to be inscribed with this Biblical verse:

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof."

The American settlers had many, many hardships, but they had more liberty than any other people on earth. That was what they came for and what they meant to keep. The verse from Leviticus on the Liberty Bell refers to the ancient Jewish year of Jubilee.

In every 50th year, the Jubilee restored the land the equality of persons that prevailed when the children of Israel entered the land of promise and both gifts came from God, as the Jubilee regularly reminded them.

Our Founding Fathers knew their Bibles as well as their Blackstone. They boldly reversed the age-old political theory that Kings derive their powers from God and asserted that both powers and unalienable rights belong to the people as direct endowments from their creator. Furthermore, they declared that Governments are instituted among men to secure their rights and to serve their purposes, and Governments continue only so long as they have the consent of the governed.

With George Washington, already commanding the American Continental Army in the field, the Second Continental Congress met here in 1776, not to demand new liberty, but to regain long-established rights which were being taken away from them without their consent.

The American Revolution was unique and remains unique in that it was fought in the name of the law as well as liberty. At the start, the Declaration of Independence proclaimed the divine source of individual rights and the purpose of human Government as Americans understood it.

That purpose is to secure the rights of the individuals against even Government itself. But, the Declaration did not tell us how to accomplish this purpose or what kind of Government to set up.

First, our independence had to be won. It was not easily won, as the nearby encampment of Valley Forge, the rude bridge at Concord and the crumbling battlements at Yorktown bear vivid witness.

We have heard much, though we cannot hear it too often, about 56 Americans who cast their votes and later signed their names to Thomas Jefferson's ringing declaration of equality and freedom so movingly read to us this morning by Miss Marian Anderson.

Do you know what price the signers of that parchment paid for their patriotism, the devotion to principle of which Lincoln spoke? John Hancock of Massachusetts was one of the wealthiest men who came to Philadelphia. Later, as he stood outside Boston and watched the enemy sweep by, he said, "Burn Boston, though it makes John Hancock a beggar."

Altogether, of the 56 men who signed our great Declaration, five were taken prisoner, twelve had their homes sacked, two lost their sons and nine died in the war itself.

Those men knew what they were doing. In the final stirring words of the Declaration, they pledged to one another "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor." And when liberty was at stake, they were willing to pay the price.

We owe a great debt to these founders and to the foot soldiers who followed General Washington into battle after battle, retreat after retreat. But, it is important to remember that final success is that struggle for independence, as in the many struggles that have followed, was due to the strength and support of ordinary men and women who were motivated by three powerful impulses—

personal freedom, self-government and national unity.

For all but the black slaves—many of whom fought bravely beside their masters because they also heard the promise of the Declaration—freedom was won in 1783, but the loose Articles of Confederation have proved adequate in war and were even less effective in peace.

Again in 1787 representatives of the people and the States met in this place to form a more perfect union, a permanent legal mechanism that would translate the principles and purposes of Jefferson's Declaration into effective self-government.

Six signers of the Declaration came back to forge the Constitution, including the sage of Philadelphia, Benjamin Franklin. Jefferson had replaced him as Ambassador in Paris. The young genius of the constitutional convention was another Virginian, James Madison. The hero of the Revolution, Washington, was called back from Mount Vernon to preside.

Seldom in history have the men who made a revolution seen it through, but the United States was fortunate. The result of their deliberation and compromises was our Constitution, which William Gladstone, a great British Prime Minister, called "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

The Constitution was created to make the promise of the Declaration come true. The Declaration was not a protest against Government but against the excesses of Government. It prescribed the proper role of Government to secure the rights of individuals and to effect their safety and their happiness.

No modern society, no individual can do this all alone, so Government is not necessarily evil but a necessary good.

The framers of the Constitution feared a central Government that was too strong, as many Americans rightly do today. The framers of the Constitution, after their experience under the Articles, feared a central Government that was too weak, as many Americans rightly do today.

They spent days studying all of the contemporary Governments of Europe and concluded with Dr. Franklin that all contained the seeds of their own destruction. So, the framers built something new, drawing upon their English traditions, on the Roman Republic, on the uniquely American institution of the town meeting to reassure those who felt the original Constitution did not sufficiently spell out the unalienable rights of the Declaration.

The First United States Congress added—and the States ratified—the first ten Amendments, which we call the Bill of Rights.

Later, after a tragic fraternal war, those guarantees were expanded to include all Americans. Later still voting rights were assured for women and for younger citizens 18 to 21 years of age.

It is good to know that in our own lifetime we have taken part in the growth of freedom and in the expansion of equality which began here so long ago. This union of corrected wrongs and expanded rights has brought the blessings of liberty to the 215 million Americans, but the struggle for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is never truly won.

Each generation of Americans, indeed of all humanity, must strive to achieve these aspirations anew. Liberty is a living flame to be fed, not dead ashes to be reversed, even in a Bicentennial year. It is fitting that we ask ourselves hard questions even on a glorious day like today.

Are the institutions under which we live working the way they should? Are the foundations laid in 1776 and 1789 still strong enough and sound enough to resist the tremors of our times? Are our God-given



rights secure, our hard-won liberties protected?

The very fact that we can ask these questions, that we can freely examine and criticize our society, is cause for confidence itself. Many of the voices raised in doubt 200 years ago served to strengthen and improve the decisions finally made.

The American adventure is a continuing process. As one milestone is passed, another is sighted. As we achieve one goal, a longer lifespan, a literate population, a leadership in world affairs, we raise our sights.

As we begin our third century, there is still so much to be done. We must increase the independence of the individual and the opportunity of all Americans to attain their full potential. We must insure each citizen's right to privacy. We must create a more beautiful America, making human works conform to the harmony of nature.

We must develop a safe society, so ordered that happiness may be pursued without fear of crime or man-made hazards. We must build a more stable international order, politically, economically and legally. We must match the great breakthroughs of the past century by improving health and conquering disease.

We must continue to unlock the secrets of the universe beyond our planet as well as within ourselves. We must work to enrich the quality of American life at work, at play and in our homes.

It is right that Americans are always improving. It is not only right, it is necessary. From need comes action, as it did here in rivals—John Adams and Thomas Jefferson—in their later years carried out a warm correspondence. Both died on the Fourth of July of 1826, having lived to see the handiwork of their finest hour endure a full 50 years.

They had seen the Declaration's clear call for human liberty and equality arouse the hopes of all mankind. Jefferson wrote to Adams that "even should the clouds of barbarism and despotism again obscure the science and libraries of Europe, this country remains to preserve and restore life and liberty to them."

Over a century later, in 1936, Jefferson's dire prophecy seemed about to come true. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, speaking for a mighty nation, reinforced by millions and millions of immigrants who had joined the American adventure, was able to warn the new despots:

"We too, born to freedom, and believing in freedom, are willing to fight to maintain freedom. We, and all others who believe as deeply as we do, would rather die on our feet than live on our knees."

The world knows where we stand. The world is ever conscious of what Americans are doing for better or for worse because the United States today remains the most successful realization of humanity's universal hope.

The world may or may not follow, but we lead because our whole history says we must. Liberty is for all men and women as a matter of equal and unalienable right. The establishment of justice and peace abroad will in large measure depend upon the peace and justice we create here in our own country, where we still show the way.

The American adventure began here with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence. It continues in a common conviction that the source of our blessings is a loving God, in whom we trust. Therefore, I ask all the members of the American family, our guests and friends, to join me now in a moment of silent prayer and meditation in gratitude for all that we have received and to ask continued safety and happiness for each of us and for the United States of America.

Thank you and God bless you.

## LET'S GIVE SMALL BUSINESS A FAIR CHANCE

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, the most pressing problem confronting this Congress has been our faltering economy. From both sides of the aisle many Members have decried our high unemployment, our high inflation rate, the lack of competition in our industries, the decline of innovation, and other symptoms of our economic ills. We have all been arduously working on legislative remedies to these problems. Yet, we have generally ignored one of the fundamental causes of our economic stagnation: the declining position of small and independent business in our economy.

Small and independent businesses provide the driving force of our economy. They spur competition. They have been shown to be the most innovative sector, providing new products which means new jobs and economic growth. Significantly, they are labor intensive. Small firm growth translates quickly into more jobs. The rapid decline of small and independent businesses is increasingly depriving our country of the spirit of the individual entrepreneur upon which it is built.

The Federal Government, more often than not, has contributed to their demise. Small business finds itself buried in Federal paperwork, strangled by regulations, and discriminated against by our tax code.

The tax code is the most serious of these problems to the small firm. While large corporations are able to take advantage of special tax provisions and have access to numerous avenues of finance, the small firm does not. They have limited access to capital and are particularly reliant upon retained earnings. Yet, the small firm pays an effective tax rate double that of large corporations.

Small and independent firms are unable to hire high priced tax specialists. Many tax provisions are too complex for them to effectively understand and utilize. The current depreciation schedule, for example, contains over 100 different categories. Various other tax provisions are like a noose around their neck. The estate tax exemption, which has not been raised one nickel in 30 years, virtually forces many small businesses to sell out in order to pay the tax.

These tax inequities, which have been a major contributor to small firm decline, will become even more critical in the immediate future. Capital formation is considered to be the greatest problem facing business in our changing economy. While giant corporations will be able to weather the strain through their many financing sources, small firms will be backed to the wall.

The avenue to reverse the decline of small and independent firms is through tax reform. We need tax reform which will give them a fair chance to survive

and grow. The Small Business Growth and Job Creation Act of 1976 seeks to give them that chance. It would amend 17 provisions of the tax code which have proven to be serious problem areas. It does not seek to give them a privileged position, only a fair and equitable chance to compete. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to examine and support this vital legislation.

## ARE SUNSET LAWS THE ANSWER?

HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, it is unusual when an idea captures the imagination of so varied a part of the philosophical spectrum as have so-called sunset laws and zero based budgeting. It is rarer still, when those ideas deal so integrally with the very matters which separate Members of differing philosophy—Government regulation and Federal budgets. Amidst the euphoria of those who claim that these approaches represent long-term solutions to the increasing problems associated with burgeoning, bureaucratic big government, I would like to insert a recent column from the Wall Street Journal by Arlen J. Large. Mr. Large observes that there is one slight catch to "sunset laws" that perhaps account for the harmonious response with which they have been met by Congress—they do not accomplish much of anything. Through the traditional, unglamorous authorization and appropriation process, Congress has all the tools that it needs to bring our Federal Government to order. The problem then is not the lack of a proper mechanism, but far more importantly the absence of resolve by Members of Congress to scrutinize the programs benefiting favored special interests. It will take a lot more than the passage of "sunset laws" to remedy this shortcoming.

The article follows:

### ARE SUNSET LAWS THE ANSWER?

(By Arlen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—It's not written down anywhere, but the working motto of Congress might as well be painted on the Capitol dome: "We don't want to hurt anybody."

So everyone's precious tax gimmicks stay stubbornly on the books, despite all the speechmaking about tax "reform." Programs for loans, subsidies, grants and other ingenious forms of "aid" roll on and on, unexamined by all but friendly committee chairmen. Federal agencies become immortal, lest one's death bruise the ego of its constituency.

But its easy-going motto is getting Congress in increasing trouble, and as good politicians the members know it. The clearest note sounding in their ears this year is a strong general dissatisfaction with growing government, a collective unhappiness with the sum total of federal busy-work which somewhere pleases the fractional constituencies. To be perceived as responding to the strong anti-government mood, the members must see to it that axes start falling. Congress must hurt someone.

Better, though, that the axing appear impersonal, the inevitable and automatic re-

sult of how the rules work. Sorry, old man, the system did it. Don't blame me.

And that explains the growing popularity among legislators, here and elsewhere, of the "sunset" approach to government. An existing federal program must be put to a special test of its worth, say, every five years. The bureaucrats who manage it must justify the first dollar they want to spend, not just the latest increase over last year's budget. In the jargon that's called zero-base budgeting, and if the test isn't met the program must automatically die. The sun sets on it, while billions of dollars are saved and millions of voters cheer.

A sunset mechanism is already in effect in Colorado, and other legislatures around the country are considering it. To apply the idea to the massive federal machine would take quite a leap, but a serious start is under way. The Senate Government Operations Committee intends to write a federal sunset bill after the Democratic Convention recess. There may not be time to pass a bill through both houses this year, but sponsors console themselves with the thought of having help next year from a newly elected President Carter, who extolls zero-base budgeting. Support for sunset laws and zero-base budgeting has even found its way into the 1976 Democratic platform.

In the Senate, the bill has 56 co-sponsors, from Kennedy to Goldwater. The attraction is that Senators like Edmund Muskie of Maine, the chief sponsor, can promise: "If this bill becomes law, there will be a dramatic change in the operations of the federal government."

#### THEORY VERSUS REALITY

On paper, there would seem to be no need for dramatic change in the method by which Congress spends the people's money, guards against waste and stamps out boon-doggies. First a federal program must be "authorized" by a law written by House and Senate committees that specialize in the subject. An authorization law sets broad policies and imposes ceilings on money appropriated from the Treasury. Many programs must be re-authorized every year or so, giving the specialist committees a chance to review results and let the bummers expire.

And there's another check. Every year almost every agency must go before the House and Senate appropriations committees to justify its budget request. Lawmakers preparing the annual appropriations bills are free to root out errors and abuses by asking the bureaucrats nasty questions. During floor debate any member of the House or Senate can propose cutting an agency's appropriation all the way to zero. All it takes is a majority vote.

In short, Congress has all the power and opportunity it needs to pull the string on big government. But the power is mostly unused, the opportunities are passed up.

The merchant marine subsidy program must be re-authorized each year, and friendly members of the House and Senate authorizing committees can be depended on to swear that the payments are essential to the nation's survival. Teachers' groups rally every three years to make sure there's no hitch in the routine re-authorization of aid to schools. The armed services committees occasionally will kill an authorization for a tank or a helicopter, but they mainly sing the Pentagon's song. At appropriations time, the members habitually focus on the increases in an agency's budget from the preceding year, and not on whether the outfit should get any money at all.

If spending programs have proven hard to stamp out by legislative will, so have special preferences in the tax laws. Four years ago no less a power than Wilbur Mills, who was chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, hit upon a crutch he thought would

make it easier for Congress to confront the "loophole" problem. All tax preferences would come up for review over a fixed three-year schedule, forcing Congress to decide which ones had enough merit to be continued. His bill even won favorable mention in the 1972 Democratic platform. Though nothing came of it, this "action-forcing" notion became a precursor to the current crop of sunset proposals.

Another inspiration for the sunset concept is the new congressional budget control system. It sets deadlines that Congress must meet at fixed times during a session for decisions to be made on spending totals and individual appropriations bills. Sponsors boast that the new budget machinery is working beautifully and can serve as a model for requiring deadlines for scrutinizing federal agencies.

"In the absence of these kinds of action-forcing procedures," says Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia, "reform proposals are likely to fall victim to the potent opposition of special interest groups."

Sen. Byrd is a co-sponsor, along with Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois, of a bill that would pose a sunset threat to federal agencies that regulate business. The President would have to follow a timetable for recommending changes, say, in the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and Congress would face deadlines in approving his plan or devising its own. If all plans are blocked by airline industry efforts to retain the regulatory status quo, the sun would set on the CAB's power to award exclusive routes or confer other economic benefits.

When the Senate Government Operations Committee starts considering sunset proposals this month, it's more likely to start with Sen. Muskie's bill applying to all government programs, not just regulatory activities. As did the old Wilbur Mills proposal, the bill would require tax preferences to be put to a fixed schedule of review by the House and Senate tax-writing committees.

The bill would require budget officials in the Executive Branch to follow the same five-year cycle as Congress in putting federal programs to a zero-based spending test. Ford administration men aren't very keen about that. The requirement is "far too mechanical and inflexible," White House budget boss James Lynn has testified. Other veteran bureaucrats warn that requiring every agency to justify all spending would just produce mounds of paper and require a bigger federal work force.

During the Kennedy administration the Agriculture Department experienced with zero-base budgeting, but abandoned it after a year. "It was just too much," recalls William Carlson, now retired, who helped plan the effort. Mr. Carlson says the exercise "is probably a good idea" for a new Cabinet officer wanting to learn just what his department does, but that "it's impossible to do every year." Zero-base budgeting can indeed spot programs having little value, he says, "but what you discover is that the lowest priority things are there for political reasons."

That brings the question right back to the political will of Congress to end somebody's federal benefits, despite the crutch of "action-forcing" timetables. One skeptic is Ernest Gellhorn, dean of Arizona University's College of Law. "If the will is there," he has testified, "putting it into statutory form does not change anything. If the will is not there, the next Congress is going to change it." He pointed specifically to clean-air deadlines set in 1970 that Congress this year is pushing back.

#### REFORM RHETORIC

The Federal Energy Administration faced a sunset situation under existing law last June 30 when its old authorization expired,

but Congress voted to extend its life. To some, this showed a lack of backbone. The extension demonstrated, complained Rep. Abner Mikva of Illinois, "that while regulatory reform is a fine topic for a rousing campaign speech, it is considerably less popular when the opportunity to translate talk into action arises."

If it appears that a sunset bill is making progress, special interest groups are sure to start begging for exemptions. A spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars already has declared it would be "both unnecessary and discriminatory" to expose veterans benefits to the sunset threat. Sen. John Glenn of Ohio, a co-sponsor of the Muskie bill, has suggested Congress itself might want to spell out sunset exemptions for some civil rights and energy-research programs. Also, Sen. Glenn isn't sure how the sunset principle would apply to such long-standing government institutions as the Navy. "That's a grey area," he says.

With the armed services committees in charge of its zero-based budget review, the Navy doubtless will be pretty safe. Indeed, the problem of the friendly committee could make the proposed zero-base budgeting requirement a fairly perfunctory exercise, with almost all programs routinely passing the test.

"There's no perfect check on a friendly committee," concedes freshman Rep. James Blanchard of Michigan, sponsor of a sunset bill in the House. Nevertheless, he thinks the independent streak being shown by more House members lately "is already breaking up the grip of friendly committee heads over programs."

And changes in public attitudes toward government may make the old we-don't-want-to-hurt-anybody motto more outdated than Capitol Hill cynics think. Sen. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, chairman of the Government Operations Committee, has for 13 years watched Congress take care of each program's narrow constituencies and he thinks things are changing. "Sure, there are small constituencies behind each program," he says, "but there's a bigger constituency out there that's tired of too-big government, and those small constituencies can't stand up against that."

The first instinct of Congress when confronted with something new is to seek an institutional fix; set up a new committee, set deadlines, tinker with the rules. Bureaucratic Mickey Mouses often disguises a failure to act on substance, and the current sunset fad could quickly descend to play-acting. But if it's only a mental crutch to get the members to thinking about the status quo in a fresh way, the exercise may be worthwhile. Politicians need all the help they can get in screwing up their courage to yell "No" when it's time to vote.

#### THE LANDING OF VIKING

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, this morning the successful landing of the Viking spacecraft on the surface of Mars was confirmed by NASA engineers and scientists. This monumental achievement occurs on the same day that Apollo 11 Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., landed on the surface of the Moon 7 years ago. In the time between Apollo 11 and the unmanned Vik-



ing landing on Mars today, much of importance has been contributed by our space program to our quality of life and economic well-being. We have entered a new era in our space program which promises a low cost transportation system by 1979—Space Shuttle, while the Viking's successful landing demonstrates again that we need to support an aggressive scientific program in space exploration. The men and women of the Viking team, industry, the universities, and Government are to be congratulated for this outstanding achievement.

The true dimensions of the Viking landing will undoubtedly exceed our expectations. If past achievements of NASA serve as a guide we can view with pride the achievement of the Viking landing as another indication, in this Bicentennial Year, of the strength and skill of the people of the United States when dedicated to an important project.

#### THE DISSERVICE OF SERVICES

**HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, although much attention has been paid to one aspect of the causes of inflation—skyrocketing increases in prices for raw materials, labor, and administrative overhead—much less has been focused on the impact of the costs of services. Recently, Mr. Godfrey Harris, a management consultant in California, published an article which makes a good case for the need to focus on the relationship between the delivery of services, one of the fastest growing sectors of our economy, and “stagflation.” I wish to take this opportunity to share Mr. Harris’ article with my colleagues:

[From the *Lightning Tree Journal*, Spring 1976]

#### THE DISSERVICE OF SERVICES

(By Godfrey Harris)

(NOTE.—The following article began as a letter to President Ford. The author, a management consultant in California, writes of its genesis: “In August [1974] when Jerry Ford moved into the White House and asked for ideas on the economy, I took pen in hand to unburden myself of my festering belief in the culpability of services in stagflation. I got a long personal answer duly signed by the President; it was duly framed and hung in my office.” Soon after, he “put some flesh around the ideas” and the letter became an article. Since he, as a consultant, falls into the service category, he is admittedly attacking his own kind. But, he says, they need attacking. What follows here is a revised and expanded version of the article which first appeared in the *Santa Monica Evening Outlook*.)

That huge category of the economy we call services may be at the bottom of the stagflation barrel, buried underneath the obvious problems of excessive petroleum prices, higher interest rates and prodigious government spending. Excessive services may, in fact, be one of the principal causes of the international economic malaise of sustained inflation along with recession, which continues despite optimistic political assertions in this campaign year.

If this is so, it is getting very little attention from professional economists. The alternating expansionist and restrictive monetary and fiscal policies they have used to tune Western economies since the 1930's generally assume that these economies are heavily dominated by the ebbs and flows of their manufacturing, mining and agricultural sectors.

Yet a more significant element of stagflation in the United States may be found in the service category, in its closed pricing policies and its lack of adequate productivity measures. With service industries and occupations now accounting for well over half the annual GNP, traditional monetary and fiscal approaches may no longer be capable of tempering the economy.

For instance: The rise in cost of a new car may easily be explained by a rise in the cost of its steel or fabric. But consider the number of service groups involved in the production of that steel and that fabric: the safety engineers, file clerks, advertising executives, compliance specialists, government officials, insurance agents, lawyers, doctors, secretaries, brokers, accountants, consultants, counselors—a long chain stretching through sub-contractors and suppliers. To what extent do these services affect production line salaries and office overheads? Could these costs ultimately be responsible for the higher steel and fabric prices?

And again: The output of the service groups is not readily measured. Yet the rising costs of these services seem evident everywhere. Consultants, accountants and attorneys tend to raise their hourly fees—not because their major costs are significantly higher, their production markedly greater, or their individual skills in increasing demand, but because of some mystic sense of what they say they deserve.

The unfortunate result of this mystic feeling of never earning enough is that these professionals often adjust their prices and fees upward in easily remembered round numbers—numbers which, translated to percentage terms, turn out to be far in excess of other rising costs.

In a post-industrial society, the trend of our economy toward even greater services is perhaps to be expected. But this does not deny the possibility that in a mature economy services can be brought into better balance with the production of goods. To do so, however, we must first come to understand how much all of us really pay for the services that enter, visibly or invisibly, into our personal costs of living. For the service ingredients of any major bill (say \$250 and up) we should perhaps demand a “unit cost truth in overhead” disclosure requirement.

In addition we can begin to question the necessity of the servicing we receive. We must determine if the necessary servicing is provided efficiently. And we must also allow more competition in service pricing—now heavily influenced by professional societies, business associations and government agencies.

One final point which could receive immediate attention from all levels and branches of government: Price fixing—although referred to by more dignified terms—is rampant among airlines and moving companies, lawyers and banks, baseball clubs and insurance companies, stock exchanges, drug stores and any number of other commercial areas. No matter how this is justified (whether to protect some professional standard, vested interest or historical precedent), a determined and consistent attack on all forms of price-fixing can begin the process of balancing the impact of services on the total economy.

However, without waiting for direct government action, individuals themselves can encourage alternatives to excessive servicing. Major food chains may think geometrically stacked and neatly arranged shelves are a

marketing necessity. But buyers elsewhere forgo this level of servicing for food plucked directly from the packer's or canner's shipping cartons—at less expense. Why do Americans accept without protest the high cost of ornate packaging, the plastic and coated paper wrapped around any and everything (usually impossible to open)? Is America the only country where it takes more talent to complete an income tax form than it took to earn the income in the first place?

The overloading of service business and service occupations—and their resistance to productivity measures—have led some to believe that the society itself, led by the Government, has unconsciously encouraged services as the least troublesome means of absorbing the increasing number of employables displaced by machines. But society may not escape the result of this dubious solution until it carefully reevaluates how its money gets allocated and how its time is spent.

This reevaluation may also result in a fundamental shift of attitude. Instead of bifurcating the labor force into white collar and blue collar, perhaps the force should be classified as clean cuff or dirty cuff workers. Those in the latter category—whether producing services or goods—should be given the higher status which they deserve and which the U.S. may now require.

#### UNIONIZATION OF THE MILITARY: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS NOT COME

**HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the question of unionization of the U.S. military has received increasing attention in recent months. It is supported by several prominent union officials and by a number of Americans generally located on the liberal end of the political spectrum. Its opponents include the military command and the various service associations.

In seeking to evaluate the proposal, I believe we should begin by disregarding the views of union officials, who naturally would like to expand their membership and power. Similarly, I believe we should disregard the views of the service associations, the sergeant's associations, and other groups who naturally would like to remove any threat to their own power and competition for their membership.

We should, in short, judge the proposal strictly on its merits. On this basis, my view is that unionization of the military would be a disaster.

In general terms, we must recognize the fundamental difference between the U.S. military and a private corporation. A corporation exists to make money, and its workers work for the same purpose. A union is therefore necessary to create a reasonable balance between the two groups in their struggle for their slices of the pie. But a military organization, both commanders and enlisted personnel, exist to serve national policy in times of urgent need. This is a critical distinction.

Some have suggested that unionization might have prevented My Lai, Kent State, and Newark. They suggest that a

soldier would be able to refuse to shoot innocent people on the grounds his union says he does not have to do it.

I give this argument very little credence. Whether we should or should not shoot innocent civilians is a matter for national policy, not for negotiations between soldiers and commanders. Humanitarian restraints must be established by the command, directed by the Congress, and enforced by the courts, or they simply will not be observed.

It is also claimed that military unions would better enable the enlisted man to get a fair deal. My view on this is that the military already gets considerably more than a fair deal, and that the last thing we need is additional featherbedding, make-work and "can't do" attitudes. This is not to say that abuses, injustice, and Mickey Mouse conditions do not exist; certainly they do. But these should and can be handled by Congress and by the command. In this respect I am 100 percent behind Admiral Zumwalt.

Let us put it bluntly: We cannot afford the military establishment we have today. We cannot afford the retirement costs we are incurring today. If we permit unionization of the military, no matter what else happens we can be sure we will be paying more and getting less. We certainly cannot afford that.

Finally, the military has a unique requirement for discipline and instant obedience which is not duplicated in any other occupation. The only way a military organization can operate is for the command to follow the laws and regulations, and for subordinates to obey their commanders within the limits of laws and regulations. Any other method of operation gravely weakens the Nation's ability to conduct military operations and cannot be tolerated.

#### CLEVELAND RADIO STATION MARKS 55 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives, the 55th anniversary of WHK radio station in Cleveland, Ohio.

As the first radio station in the State, WHK has had a proud and illustrious history. Since July 26, 1921, when they aired their first program, they have continually received top ratings and citations for excellence in the broadcasting field.

Under the able guidance of Mr. Milton Maltz, president of the Malrite Broadcasting Co.—owners of WHK—the station has developed a well-rounded format of music, news, talk shows, and community affairs programming. Over the years, WHK has kept up with the times and modified their programs to meet the needs of a changing society.

Currently, the American Research Bu-

reau has given WHK a first place rating in the metropolitan area during prime time.

Mr. Speaker, July 26, 1976, will be "WHK Day" in Cleveland in honor of 55 outstanding years of service to the community. At this time, I ask my colleagues to join with me in recognition of WHK. Their presence in the annals of American broadcasting has been a significant asset to the entire communications media. Let us join in wishing them many more years of meritorious service.

#### CREDIT UNION FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT

### HON. JOHN Y. MCCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. MCCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I have received this week a petition signed by more than 1,100 of my constituents requesting that the House of Representatives take action on the Credit Union Financial Institutions Act. I am gratified by this tremendous showing of support for credit union reforms, and share in the request for action.

I have already contacted the chairman of the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing requesting that such legislation be considered separately from other financial institution reforms in order to remove it from the controversies that created such difficulties for the Financial Reform Act. I urge my colleagues to join me in this request.

I now insert my letter to the chairman, and the petition from the members of the Nebraska credit unions be placed in the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1976.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,  
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Currency  
and Housing, Rayburn House Office  
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Credit unions are one of the most important segments of our financial industry. They were formed to meet the needs of their members when banking services were unavailable elsewhere and have continued to provide necessary services for a growing membership. A credit union is often the first point of contact a person has with a financial institution, and provides the basis for a person's life-long opinion of the financial world.

But without removing some of the restraints imposed on credit unions and allowing them to expand their services, they will have increasing difficulty competing in today's financial industry. Congress must recognize the changes taking place in this industry and allow credit unions to keep up with the changing needs of their members.

I urge the Banking, Currency and Housing Committee to consider credit union reform legislation separately from other financial institution reforms in order to remove this type of legislation from the controversies that created such difficulties for the Financial Reform Act. It is my desire to see a credit union reform bill reported from the Committee at the earliest possible date and enacted by this Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN Y. MCCOLLISTER,  
Member of Congress.

#### PETITION

We the people of the 2nd Congressional District in the State of Nebraska in accordance with Rule XXII, of the Rules of the House of Representatives do hereby petition the United States House of Representatives to enact amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act as contained in the "Credit Union Financial Institutions Act Amendments of 1975" (H.R. 474), to permit Federal credit unions to offer millions of members long-term real estate loans, revolving lines of credit, extended repayment periods on consumer, mobile home and home improvement loans, third party payments, and other contemporary financial services; and,

Do hereby commend the United States Senate for its expeditious consideration and passage of similar legislation for credit unions, contained in the "Financial Institutions Act of 1975" (S. 1267).

We the members of the Nebraska Credit Unions, Petition the Congress to enact this vitally needed legislation for credit unions during this year, our nation's Bicentennial, to enable more than 22,000 credit unions to more adequately serve the contemporary financial needs of over thirty million members throughout the United States. And, we ask that this petition be introduced on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and made a part of the official proceedings of that chamber.

#### SOUTHEAST ALTERNATIVES PROJ- ECT: A MODEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in 1971, the U.S. Office of Education selected three school districts as pilot programs for its experimental schools project. What has come to be known as the southeast alternatives project in Minneapolis was one of these pilot sites. Located in the southeast portion of Minneapolis, the project consists of three elementary schools together with one free school, and one high school. Approximately 2,500 students are enrolled in the five programs.

The original contract between the Minneapolis public schools and the National Institute of Education singled out a central overarching objective for the project: to explore the potential for comprehensive change in the educational structure and programming of the southeast area schools.

On the one hand, this has involved offering students, parents, and teachers a choice among four alternative approaches to learning: a traditional, self-contained classroom format; a continuous progress setting in which students are grouped by ability level rather than age level; an open program in which students are given a great deal of flexibility in structuring their day; and a free school which deemphasizes a structured curriculum.

On the other hand, this objective has entailed a decentralization of the decisionmaking process and an extensive involvement of community members in the schools' programs. Decisionmaking



has passed to a significant degree from the board of education to the project participants. All members of the school community have had the opportunity to actively participate in the schools' governing process and day-to-day educational programming. This has insured that decisions concerning financing, staffing, programming, and evaluations have had their roots in community preferences.

Almost everyone who has become familiar with the project has been impressed with its achievements. Ron Alvarez of the project's sponsoring body, the National Institute of Education, has remarked—

We're very satisfied with what's been accomplished and what we feel is the impact of SEA on Minneapolis.

The Minneapolis Board of Education, largely as a result of the SEA experience, has declared its intention to extend educational alternatives to all areas of the city. The southeast Minneapolis community itself has been extremely supportive—whereas in 1971 35 percent of the area parents were pleased with the schools, by 1974 65 percent were. People outside Minneapolis have visited the project in large numbers—5,000–6,000 in 1975—suggesting that the project's philosophy and operation may hold much of value for other school districts.

The project completed its final year of a 5-year funding cycle this spring, having received a total of \$6.5 million from the U.S. Office of Education and the National Institute of Education. Its schools will now operate on the same financial basis as the other Minneapolis public schools. Although its experimental phase has been officially closed, Southeast Alternatives will undoubtedly continue to have a significant impact on the way the people of Minneapolis view and approach comprehensive educational change.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a recent Minneapolis Tribune article written by Greg Pinney about the project's successes. I would also like to insert the testimony I presented last summer to the House Subcommittee on Select Education when it was considering legislation to extend the authorization of the National Institute of Education. The materials follow:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune,  
June 14, 1976]

**SOUTHEAST ALTERNATIVES EDUCATION PROJECT  
WILL GRADUATE WITH HONORS**  
(By Gregor W. Pinney)

About a month from now, David Roffers will clean out his desk and lock up the office of the Southeast Alternatives project in Minneapolis, bringing an end to a costly experiment that just about everyone considers successful.

It is counted a success because it has proved that regular neighborhood schools can be abolished and replaced with special-style schools. And it proved that many parents and students will choose the schools they want and that the students survive—that they learn basic skills even though they are taught in vastly different ways.

Financed with \$6.5 million in Federal money, the alternatives project has transformed the public schools in southeast Minneapolis. And it has inspired an alternative movement in the rest of the city's schools as well.

The project took four neighborhood elementary schools and converted them into special institutions ranging from a traditional school to a radical free school. It gave all the students in southeast free bus rides so they could attend the school they wanted. The students each had an extra \$2,840 in federal money spent on them during the five years of the project.

"We're very satisfied with what's been accomplished and what we feel is the impact Southeast Alternatives is having on Minneapolis," said Ronald Alvarez at the National Institute of Education in Washington.

But now the federal funds are running out, and the southeast schools will have to get along on the same money as all the other schools in the city.

After he closes the office, Roffers, who has directed the project in its final year, will move on to some other administrative job in the school system. The people on the evaluation team, who have produced scores of research reports, will be looking for work. The teachers who wrote new courses have been disbanded, and the extra aides who enriched the program have been withdrawn from the classrooms.

Praise has come not only from the federal government, which paid the bill, but also from parents and students, who got the benefits.

"I think it's worked out smashing," said Ann Legg, the mother of two school children, "and I'll be very, very sad if anything happens to it." Mrs. Legg was one of the people in 1971 who joined school teachers and administrators to draw up the proposal for the federal grant.

In a 1972 survey, 92 percent of the elementary parents and 75 percent of the secondary parents said they were satisfied with their children's schools.

Mrs. Legg won't have to worry for the immediate future. All of the current alternative programs in the southeast schools are being kept in operation, which probably is the most solid proof of its success.

Further proof is the fact that the Minneapolis School Board is spreading the alternative idea across the city. But the board is doing so largely to help with desegregation by giving students something more palatable at the end of a forced bus ride.

The idea of choices overturns the centuries-old belief that there is "one best way" to educate elementary children and that the neighborhood school provides it.

Alternatives now are well accepted in Minneapolis but in 1971, it was a risky idea. Skeptics wondered if parents and students really would exercise choice, whether the various types of schools would last and whether students would learn anything in the more radical alternatives.

And underlying it all was the question of whether a school system could pull itself out of tradition and make "comprehensive change." The federal government decided to put money into testing that question.

The "Experimental Schools Program" was set up by Congress, and Minneapolis was one of three districts selected for grants in 1971 out of 500 applicants. The others were Berkeley, Calif., and the Franklin Pierce District near Tacoma, Wash.

One family, the MacEacherns of 1717 Brook Av. S.E.—have tried just about all the options. They offer an example of how the school works.

Seven-year-old Anne MacEachern was a second-grader this year at the Tuttle Contemporary School where the classes are directed by the teachers and where the students move along together pretty much in standard style. Peggy, 10, was a fifth-grader at the Marcy Open School where students work on their own projects after they and their teachers have decided what to do. Phil, 12, was in a seventh-grade open program that

operates on the same idea at Marshall-University High School.

Steve, 14, also was at Marshall University, but he was in a "graded" program in ninth grade that stresses standard school subjects in standard ways, much like Tuttle Elementary. Prior to last year, Steve went to the Free School where students take prime responsibility for their education and where they spend a lot of time preparing to cope with the outside world. He changed, he said, because he wanted a little more structured program. "I guess maybe I didn't think I was getting enough of things like English and social studies."

The oldest MacEachern child, Katie, who graduated last year at the age of 15 from Marshall-University High School, took a fairly traditional course of studies.

The only school the MacEacherns have not tried is the Pratt Continuous Progress School—the middle of the spectrum—where teachers decide what students will learn but the students are supposed to move at their own rate.

"I think the kids are different, and each of them at various times thought that a certain school was the place to go," said the children's father, Donald MacEachern, an education professor at the University of Minnesota.

Most students, however, stayed closer to home. Only 26 percent ventured beyond their neighborhood schools in the first year, and that figure rose to just 38 percent by the end of the fourth year. But the important point, say alternatives officials, is that students could move if they desired.

Change was what Southeast Alternatives was all about—comprehensive change. Alternatives were just a part. So were the new committees of students, parents, teachers, and administrators who got into such previously forbidden territory as screening candidates for school principalships. So were the aides. So were the programs for retraining teachers in new techniques. So was the southeast director who made decisions that otherwise would have been made at school district headquarters. Did the project succeed in putting them all together?

"Yes, indeed," said Larry Reynolds, vice president of Educational Services Group in Edina, which has been hired for \$460,000 as the "external evaluator." When Reynolds writes his final report this summer, he will say, "Southeast is a model for change."

**STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE DONALD M. FRASER ON THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION BEFORE THE SELECT EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, JULY 30, 1975**

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you this morning about the National Institute of Education.

#### SOUTHEAST ALTERNATIVES

In 1971, the United States Office of Education selected three school districts as pilot programs for the Experimental Schools Project; each district was given a grant to develop a continuous kindergarten through grade twelve program. The Minneapolis Public Schools district was one of these pilot sites. By the end of its five year funding cycle, Southeast Alternatives (the name chosen for the project) will have received a total of \$6.5 million from the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education. The first 27 months of the project were funded directly by the Office of Education; the final 33 months have been funded through a contract entered into by the Minneapolis Public Schools and the National Institute of Education.

Located in the southeast sector of Minneapolis, Southeast Alternatives (SEA) consists of three elementary schools, one free school,

and one high school. As of June of this year, approximately 2,300 students were enrolled in the five programs (the entire school system has an enrollment of 56,000 students). Each of the schools is open to any child within the southeast area.

The original SEA proposal of 1971 and the Minneapolis Public Schools/NIE Scope of Work Contract of 1973 singled out a central, overarching objective of the project; to explore the potential for comprehensive change in the educational structure and programming of the southeast area schools. In terms of both organizational pattern and curriculum articulation, a K-12 continuity was to be developed. This continuity would in turn rest on the project's three foundation stones: the availability of distinct educational alternatives, the involvement of the community in program development and implementation, and the decentralization of decision-making authority.

The SEA/NIE contract stipulates that "the project will test four alternative school styles (K-6) and selected options in schooling programs for grades 7-12 articulated upon the elementary objectives." Stated somewhat differently, SEA offers parents, students, and teachers the opportunity to choose among alternative approaches to learning. Not only are parents and students encouraged to choose the school which best matches the students' needs and abilities, but teachers are able to select the school whose format best fits their personal approach to teaching.

The concept of alternatives is predicated upon the belief that no single learning environment is best for all children. By structuring discrete alternatives in the way space is organized and time is used, in the pace at which students are encouraged to proceed, in the degree to which students are allowed to formulate their daily program, and in the manner in which material is presented by the teachers (whether through a single teacher handling a particular class, a team of teachers exercising responsibility for a series of classrooms, or a teacher managing a specialized interest center), the SEA schools furnish learning environments which are responsive to divergent desires and needs.

*Tuttle Contemporary School* is in many ways similar to the traditional elementary school setting—the classrooms are age-graded, self-contained, and generally the responsibility of one teacher. But while an emphasis is placed on basic skills, Tuttle makes use of exciting contemporary learning methods such as computer terminals, arts and crafts workshops, and unusual educational games.

*Pratt Continuous Progress School* is divided into ungraded, multi-age classrooms, a setting which allows each child to proceed at his or her own rate. As in Tuttle, an emphasis is placed on attaining certain skill levels, but at Pratt the tempo is closely tailored to the particular student. Mornings are spent in a structured language arts, mathematics, and social studies program; afternoons are devoted to two week courses on subjects chosen by the students.

*Marcy Open School* organizes its day into four main time blocs: the morning meeting in which plans for the day are discussed; project time in which students work on individual or group projects of their own choosing; center time in which students use the woodworking, music, pottery, science, nature, media, or other centers; and basic skills time in which students are involved in more traditional reading and mathematics tasks. Students do not work out of any particular classroom and while teachers are centered in a single room, they are free to develop the room in any way they like.

*Southeast Free School* offers a K-12 program (unlike the K-6 programs of Tuttle, Pratt, and Marcy). Loosely grouped into younger, middle, and older age categories, the students actively participate in local and

national affairs and causes. For example, the school has recently organized trips to California (where they observed activities of the United Farm Workers), Mexico, and, just this spring, Washington, D.C. The school steers away from a highly structured curriculum, preferring instead to encourage students to make their own choices about their use of time. Minimum levels of achievement are expected, however, and basic skills resource centers include records of a student's progress.

*Marshall-University High School* attempts to extend alternatives past the elementary level by offering a wide range of courses and by allowing a student (with parental consent) to design his or her own educational program. Students are able to choose from forty or fifty English, mathematics, and social studies courses, to develop independent study courses, and to become involved in a number of off-campus learning programs (for example, students may attend classes at the University of Minnesota or earn credits through work in the community).

The evolution of these alternatives has made it necessary for teachers to develop skills appropriate to non-traditional learning environments. Soon after the creation of SEA, it became apparent that staff development programs would be a critical element in the project's success. In 1972, NIE was asked by the Minneapolis Public Schools to help fund a SEA teacher center which would serve the inservice needs of the program. The Institute agreed. Since 1973, a joint University of Minnesota/Minneapolis Public Schools Teacher Center has provided invaluable assistance to SEA by helping staff meet the challenges of educational alternatives.

Southeast Alternatives is perhaps foremost a test of alternative education. Yet, it is also a test of decentralized governance. Over the last few years, the Minneapolis Public Schools have attempted to decentralize their administrative structure. Ultimate decision-making authority continues to reside in the Board of Education and the central administration, but four administrative areas have been created (the North, East, West, and Southeast—with the closing of the SEA funding cycle, the Southeast and West administrative areas will be merged), each with their own Superintendent, each responsible for the day-to-day operation of the area schools. Under this scheme, decision-making responsibilities have, to a significant degree, been transferred to the SEA director, the school administrators and staff, and the community.

Decentralized governance has occurred in two respects. First, decision-making authority has passed from the Board of Education to the project. Second, each school has been given wide flexibility in determining its program.

On a project-wide level, two groups are involved in the governance process. The first is the Southeast Council. Charged with the responsibility of meeting monthly with the SEA director to advise him about community concerns, the Council includes parents, teachers, and students. The second group is the SEA Management Team. This body, which includes the director, principals of the five schools, and managers of the K-12 programs, decides the major policy questions which determine how the project is to be run.

On the individual school level, all five programs have established advisory/governing councils comprising parents, staff, faculty, and occasionally students. According to a recent study of participation in governance prepared by the SEA Internal Evaluation Team—

"A variety exists in the roles and organizations of these groups, reflective of the variety in the alternative educational programs in SEA which these groups serve. The groups

spend most of their time on planning programs and developing procedures for implementing these programs, and less time on budget and personnel issues."

The southeast community was integrally involved in the formation of SEA. Consequently, a vested interest in the program's success was immediately created. As the project has unfolded, this vested interest has been nurtured and broadened into a consensus as to the validity of the project's goals and approach. Through the active participation in policy-making of all elements within the school community, decisions concerning financing, staffing, programming, and evaluations have had their roots in community preferences. Perhaps this helps explain the widely felt feeling of satisfaction with the project—because the community has been assured of a major voice, SEA's evolution has been in fundamental harmony with community sentiments.

The third characteristic of SEA is the involvement of community members and resources in the schools' educational programs. This characteristic is closely interwoven with community participation in the governing process insofar as the advisory/governance bodies at each of the schools play a pivotal role in determining the contours of the school day activities. However, this characteristic refers more specifically to the schools' utilization of community volunteers and resources.

By an extensive use of volunteers and other community resources, the schools are able to maintain a low-adult/student ratio, expose a wider segment of the community to school programs, and integrate students into their social and political surroundings on a more regular basis. For example, the Southeast Free School has estimated that in any given week almost 25 parents, student teachers, and college students spend five hours apiece doing volunteer work for the school. Similarly, Marcy Open School's 1974 Community Day Activities (extending over three months) utilized over 70 different site locations as resources and drew one of every four Marcy parents to away-from-the-building activities.

#### THE IMPACT OF SOUTHEAST ALTERNATIVES

In attempting to assess the impact of the Southeast Alternatives project, three spheres of influence can be identified: the southeast Minneapolis community itself, the Minneapolis Public School system as a whole, and other school systems.

That SEA has fundamentally altered the area's educational patterns strikes me as beyond question. The foregoing discussion has sought to underscore both the degree to which SEA has replaced traditional programming with distinctly different approaches to learning and the extent to which the community has become involved in the governance and programming of its schools. The following results of the SEA Evaluation Team's Parent and Staff Surveys reinforce these conclusions:

In 1971, 25% of SEA students attended schools other than those nearest their home; in 1975, almost 50% did;

In 1974, 80% of SEA staff members felt that SEA was more effective than traditional programs in getting community members to participate in school programs;

In 1971, 35% of SEA parents were pleased with the southeast schools; in 1974, 65% were.

Moreover, the provision of options has not meant, as some feared, a diminution in students' mastery over basic skills. Students enrolled in SEA programs have scored well on city-wide standardized tests (it should also be noted that many feel standardized tests to be an inadequate gauge of the learning which occurs in a non-traditional setting).

The impact of SEA's successes on the rest of the school system has been considerable. Perhaps the most noteworthy testimony to



this impact is the decision of the Minneapolis schools to extend alternatives city-wide. In the words of the Superintendent of Schools, John B. Davis—

"What we have begun in southeast Minneapolis has not gone unnoticed. The nation is watching and envious. Parents, students, and our own faculty in many parts of the city have asked and have demanded alternatives for their schools, and they are being provided. The School Board has led the way in its support. The Board has set a goal that every elementary pupil will have an alternative available to him or her by 1976."

In this vein, it was recently announced that Marshall-University High School will add a 6-12 open school program and a 6-12 continuous progress program in the fall. Thus, every student in southeast Minneapolis will have the opportunity to follow a given alternative through the K-12 continuum.

The inception and development of new learning models is invariably costly in terms of money, time, and other human resources. Hopefully, the SEA experience will help minimize these costs at other sites. The building on the SEA experience has already begun. There will be a number of alternative programs in each of the other three administrative areas when school begins in the fall. In attempt to prepare teachers for the implementation of these options, the school district arranged last year for 1,500 district teachers to spend a week in the SEA program. Not only were these teachers given a first-hand exposure to classroom activities, they were also incorporated into discussions and seminars on nontraditional learning methods.

The vast number of non-Minneapolis people who visit SEA annually (5-6,000 this year alone) suggests that the attractiveness of the SEA model is not limited to a particular school system. To cite one example, last year the entire teaching staff of Canada's Manitoba province came to observe SEA—they subsequently announced their intention to introduce alternatives to their system.

#### THE ROLE OF NIE

The financial and technical support of NIE has furnished SEA with the underpinnings essential to its viability. The Institute's contributions have been three-fold.

First, by entering into a cooperative funding contract with the Minneapolis Public Schools, the Institute ensured that controls over the quality of educational services would be maintained after federal funding had been terminated. The contract stipulated that there would be a gradual phase-out of federal funding over a five year period—as the federal share of the burden decreased, the local share would increase until Minneapolis finally assumed full fiscal responsibility for the project. An automatic incentive to develop a self-sufficient program was therefore built into Minneapolis' side of the equation. In this way NIE maximized the likelihood that the experimental school cluster would be able to operate within the public school system.

Second, NIE has attempted to provide for the needs of teachers and administrators by encouraging the formation and expansion of the University of Minnesota/Minneapolis Public Schools Teacher Center. Its support of the Center represents a recognition of the need to retool and regenerate teachers who have been trained in traditional learning environments. This support also reflects an understanding of the inherent value of forging cooperation between the university and the public schools in designing preservice, inservice, and curriculum development programs.

Finally, NIE has provided local educators with the opportunity to design their own models of comprehensive change. The Institute has turned away from a posture

which demands that predetermined Washington blueprints be transplanted throughout the country; it has chosen instead to furnish the financial and technical wherewithal necessary to assist a locally formulated proposal. Ron Alvarez, the NIE project director for SEA, emphasized this notion in a recent evaluation of SEA's progress:

"The satisfactory aspects of the projects are increased by the fact that they have been developed and put together by local people—they are not something that is imposed by Washington. In such an arrangement, the project director acts as a partner or counselor."

The Institute has had its share of birth and growing pains. Yet, it has also had its successes. The concept of federally directed and stimulated educational research is a powerful and worthy concept, indeed an indispensable concept. With proper leadership and adequate financial support, the National Institute of Education can become an increasingly effective tool with which to translate this concept into improved educational opportunities for all our children.

### THE OLYMPIC GAMES

## HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Olympic games in Montreal have become a farce. And regrettably it is Canada that set the tone. When a democratic country such as Canada violates its pledge and imposes political preconditions for participation on countries otherwise eligible to participate in the Olympic games, it follows, as night follows day, that other countries—particularly those not democratic—will impose their own conditions as well.

As of today 17 nations with 465 athletes left Olympic Village. The New York Times today reports:

According to the International Olympic Committee, official letters of withdrawal have been received from 13 countries, including Kenya, Nigeria, and Ethiopia. The number of athletes in this group was placed at 399 by the I.O.C. Four additional countries, among them Algeria and Iraq, have notified the I.O.C. they are preparing to leave with 66 athletes.

These withdrawals relate to conditions that these countries would like to impose on New Zealand.

I believe that the United States erred when it did not call a halt to these proceedings by advising that if the Republic of China, Taiwan, was not permitted to participate in the same fashion as all other countries, the United States would withdraw. One cannot temporize in a matter of these dimensions and by temporizing as the United States did, we helped in further politicizing the Olympic games.

I deplore the repressive governments of the Republic of China and South Africa as I do their counterparts across the world, for example the U.S.S.R. and the Peoples' Republic of China, to cite a few. But that is not what the Olympic games are all about. It would be unacceptable for any of these countries—whether I like them or not—to be ex-

cluded because of their repressive policies toward their own peoples. Furthermore, it is an outrage to allow other countries to set their own political conditions for participation by other sovereign countries. We have not seen the last of this matter: indeed, we have set the stage for that which will occur in Moscow in the 1980 Olympics. And what conditions will the Soviet Union impose? Will we temporize then?

I am appending my correspondence on the matter with President Ford and Philip Krumm, president of the U.S. Olympic Committee. Regrettably no responses have been received but their ill-conceived actions have spoken for them. I am also appending the New York Times editorial of today on the subject:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1976.

HON. GERALD FORD  
President, The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I urge you that in the event the Olympics Committee fails to obtain a reversal of Canada's decision barring the Republic of China (Taiwan) from participating under its name in the Olympics in Canada, you have the United States withdraw its participation from the Olympic games.

To do otherwise would set a precedent that will have no end and will ultimately destroy the very nature of the Olympic Games by politicizing them. I happen not to be a supporter of the Republic of China and I hasten to add that I do not support the Peoples Republic of China either. I am opposed to tyranny whether it be on the left or the right. But that is not the question. If as a condition to participation in the Olympics, countries have to demonstrate either democratic values or at the very least non-repression of their own people, then there are perhaps two dozen of such countries that would pass either or both of those tests. And if we use those tests we will bar the Soviet Union and every Communist state as well as the military juntas that abound in Africa, Latin America and Asia.

While I deplore both the repression found in the Soviet Union and South Africa, I believe both should participate in the Olympic Games.

I urge you, therefore, to place Lord Killanin on notice that if there is any resolution other than full participation in the Games by the Republic of China that United States' participation will immediately end.

If we allow Canada, a democratic country, to impose its politics on the Olympics, what will be imposed when those Olympic Games are held in the Soviet Union in 1980? And will we be told then as we are told now that the Games must go on because so many athletes have their hearts set upon them? No, Mr. President, principle in this case as is generally the case is far more important than expediency.

All the best.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1976.

MR. PHILIP KRUMM,  
President, U.S. Olympic Committee, New  
York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KRUMM: Enclosed is a letter I have written to President Ford setting forth my opinion on the current situation relating to the Olympic Games, Canada and the Republic of China.

I hope that you will agree that the United States should withdraw our participants in the Montreal Olympic Games if Canada persists in its position.

I would appreciate having your views on this matter.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

[From the New York Times, July 20, 1976]

#### DESTROYING THE OLYMPICS

The abrupt withdrawal of some two dozen national teams from the Montreal Olympics—and, more fundamentally, the far-reaching political attitudes thus displayed—brings explosively to the fore the long-simmering issue of whether the Olympic Games, as presently organized, are worth holding. We think they are not.

The whole concept of open, global sporting competition is being debased before the world's eyes. In human terms the most poignant travesty is the patent exploitation of skilled young athletes by their governments. Beyond that what is happening is an appalling distortion of competition in sport into political expression, as much as a United Nations vote or the speech of a foreign minister. This is not what sport is about; this is not what should be asked or expected of athletes striving to excel in their chosen challenge.

The African boycott raises totally different issues from the earlier withdrawal of Taiwan from the Games. Taiwan's athletes were responding to what they saw as a slur upon their own national identity by the host country, Canada. The African teams, in contrast, were asked to make a political statement having nothing to do with the Olympics. They were protesting the willingness of another national competitor, New Zealand, to meet South Africa in rugby, a non-Olympic sport, in a series of matches far from Montreal and totally outside the Olympic framework.

Obviously no athlete or nation can or should be required to participate in the Olympics. African governments, or any other, have every right to pull out—though they might give some thought to the hurt they thereby inflict upon those of their own citizens who have been training so tirelessly for the moment of test that through no fault of theirs, is now denied them.

But the point of the Olympics, beyond all the regional or single-sport competitions, is universality, or the nearest to it that can be practically achieved. The athletes who remain in the Games are hurt almost as much as those ordered out—a gold medal for the 1,500 meters shines less brightly when the world's record holder is not even running.

Unless the Olympics are to degenerate further into a clubby and exclusive—and ludicrously expensive—vestige of a simpler world, without valid claim to universal excellence or even to existence, some fundamental reforms are inevitable; and the sooner they are effected, the better. To argue that the modern Olympics have always been politicized, as they have, does not require that they must continue ever more so. The downward progression has already gone too far.

The emphasis on individual achievement, which is what the Olympic spirit should glorify, would be enhanced by abolition of each country's flags, anthems and all the nationalistic glitter that may once have been necessary to attract support but now only distracts. All the world can thrill at the unparalleled beauty of a graceful 15-year-old gymnast—and whether she is from Rumania or Ruritania is irrelevant. Team sports in general are inappropriate at the Olympics, and only exacerbate national pretensions.

The increasingly troublesome distinction between "amateur" and "professional" athletes—and all the gray area that differing national practices put in between—is another vestige that distorts the quest for universal excellence, as Wimbledon and other sporting competitions have already recognized.

The International Olympic Committee and all the national organizers have been notoriously resistant to suggestions for basic reform. Perhaps the best hope for change therefore, rests among the athletes themselves; they represent the people most troubled by anachronistic customs, they knew each other and share many common values—and they are the one element without which there could be no Olympic Games at all.

If serious pressure for reform could begin now, within the corridors and common rooms of Montreal's Olympic Village, perhaps the Olympics could yet emerge with new life. Left to the governments, the politicians, the committees and the hucksters, the Olympic flame is rapidly flickering out.

PASTOR RICHARD LEWIS DETRICH:  
"COME HOME, AMERICA"

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 I had the honor of participating in the Bicentennial celebration of the New Life Community Church, 3737 North Sherman Boulevard in Milwaukee. I was especially moved by the inspirational Bicentennial sermon delivered by Pastor Richard Lewis Detrich. I want to share with my colleagues Pastor Detrich's thoughtful comments about the origins of this country and the unfinished tasks before us. The text of his sermon follows:

COME HOME, AMERICA!

(By Pastor Richard Lewis Detrich)

Today is July 4, 1976. Two hundred years ago today the United States of America began. Or did it?

#### THE FIRST GREAT AMERICAN REVOLUTION

While I realize that it's too late to call off today's birthday celebration, there are those who think we've picked the wrong year in which to celebrate our bicentennial. You ask, "But wasn't the Declaration of Independence signed two-hundred years ago today?" Yes. That was when our nation had its organizational birth. But those who suggest that this is the wrong year for celebration point to what they believe was the spiritual conception of the nation, its organic birth-date, some four decades earlier!

And for that the spotlight shifts from the grandeur of Independence Hall in Philadelphia to a church on the banks of the Raritan River outside the town of Somerville, New Jersey. First Reformed Church of Raritan was a very orthodox, traditional church in 1720, described by churchmen of the day as "very feeble in spiritual knowledge." It was formal and orthodox and clung tenaciously to outdated Dutch traditions, including use of the Dutch language.

The church called a young, twenty-eight-year-old minister from Westphalia, Germany, to be its pastor. His name was Theodore Frelinghuysen, and he created quite a stir by changing everything—and very quickly! One of his radical changes was to begin preaching in English. He was a dynamic, compelling preacher who believed in the necessity of a personal relationship with God through Jesus Christ. He told how this could change a person and give new life. People in the eighteenth century, as now, were looking for that! Many believed and the church grew rapidly. Frelinghuysen's preaching in New Jersey was the beginning of a great revival that swept through the middle colonies and was known as the Great Awakening.

One of the key figures in the Great Awakening was another young minister, twenty-five-year-old George Whitefield. Whitefield came to the colonies from England and, dressed exactly as I am today and traveling on horseback, he preached throughout the colonies, speaking an average of forty hours a week! Ben Franklin once went to hear him in Philadelphia. Old Ben was determined that he wouldn't be moved by Whitefield, but the spell of the preacher was too great. Halfway through the sermon, Franklin decided to put all the copper coins in his pockets into the offering basket. Then he decided to put all the silver coins into the basket. When Whitefield finished, Franklin emptied the contents of his pockets into the offering basket!

Whitefield preached a simple message of the good news of new life in Christ and people responded by the thousands. Fundamental to the preaching of the Great Awakening was the concept that man was individually responsible before God for his actions, his mistakes, and his sins. The sins were strongly stressed in lengthy and sometimes "hell-fire and brimstone" sermons. Dramatically, man was presented as being imprisoned and bound in chains by sin. But what was equally emphasized—a fact sometimes forgotten today when we look back on those colonial preachers—was the concept of a loving God who made it possible for man to be delivered and freed from his sin and the punishment for his sin. Freedom was available, but it was man's individual responsibility to accept the freedom offered in Jesus Christ. The Great Awakening embedded in the thinking of the common man two great concepts which would lie at the very heart of the Declaration of Independence and the American philosophy. These were the concepts of *personal freedom and individual responsibility*. The revival of the Great Awakening swept the colonies breaking down barriers, ignoring national backgrounds, and binding the people together. *The Great Awakening was the first great American revolution!*

When in 1776 the political revolution finally came, it followed by almost four decades the moral and spiritual revolution of the Great Awakening. The political revolution grew out of the great emphasis on inner freedom and individual responsibility which were the hallmarks of the first great American revolution that began in a Reformed Church on the banks of the Raritan River under the leadership of a young preacher named Theodore Frelinghuysen.

A few years ago on the Fourth of July, an enterprising newspaper reporter interviewed 122 people in Madison, Wisconsin, showing them a paper on which were written these words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it."

Most of the people interviewed thought it was written by some radical students from the University! Others said it was silly idealism. One thought it was the propaganda of a Communist sympathizer. Only thirteen out of 122 people recognized it as a portion of the Declaration of Independence.

When the framers of the Declaration met to put their dreams on paper, they were doing something really far out! It had never been done before! Many said it was impossible! It would never work! But they declared it to be their dream, believed it could work, and set about to make it work. Therefore, today we celebrate that these principles and dreams have held a nation together for two hundred years! While not all of our



founder fathers were Christians, they were deeply influenced by the thinking that resulted from the first great American revolution.

#### A COUNTRY THAT BEGAN IN FAITH

One of the wisest rulers ever to live was King Solomon. Solomon recognized the importance of a strong and vital faith in the God of his father David if his nation were to survive and be strong so he built a beautiful temple for the worship of God. The night after the dedication of this splendid temple, God himself appeared to King Solomon and assured him that when problems and trials come to the nation, that, "... if my people who are called by my name humble themselves, and pray and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land. But," continues God, "if you turn aside and forsake my statutes and my commandments which I have set before you, and go and serve other gods and worship them, then I will pluck you up from the land which I have given you..." (2 Chronicles 7:14, 19, 20)

God looked at the beautiful temple just completed and said to King Solomon and the nation, "This is a place for prayer, repentance, and faith. If you keep the faith you will be prosperous. But if you go your own way, make your own gods and follow after them, then this temple will stand as a grim reminder to the fact that you forsook your God."

This has something to say to us about the role of faith in the American experience. Certainly everyone in the United States in 1776 was not, nor are they now, "Christian." Furthermore neither the United States nor any country can be called "Christian." But if you will accept with me the idea that the revival of the Great Awakening laid the foundation for the ideas of the American democratic dream, you will see that it is a fact that individual Christian faith is at the root of our nation's history. Without the Great Awakening I wonder if we would have been able to conceive such a unique concept of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

When the pilgrims first arrived, five hundred miles off their course, and landed on the bare and banded arm of Massachusetts Bay instead of Virginia, they fell down on their knees and declared their purpose with these words: "We establish this state to the glory of God and the spread of the Christian religion."

And those who came after shared that faith, though perhaps expressing it differently.

After the establishment of the United States, when the Western expansion began, the Methodists ordained men, put them on horses, and sent them West, starting churches and riding the circuit. In places where there were no churches these brave pioneers made their homes their cathedrals. When the minister only rode through once or twice a year these settlers depended on their own study of a huge, well-worn family Bible.

Many of your ancestors, when they came to Wisconsin from Holland in the mid-nineteenth century and settled in Milwaukee, Cedar Grove, and Sheboygan, came with that same faith in God. If they came from Germany, Sweden, Poland, or the Ukraine, they brought with them their faith. It wasn't always expressed the same, but it was a vital faith in God that saw them across the ocean, through Ellis Island and New York, to this place they made their home.

On this two hundredth birthday, how tragic it would be if we who have inherited all this, patted ourselves on the back and said, "What a great nation we have built." How tragic it would be if we ignored the faith of our fathers! On creaking, rocking, wave-washed boats; on the sandy shores of a new

land with a strange and inhospitable wilderness; on the garbage-strewn streets and in the tenements of the lower East side of New York; on conestoga wagons heading West; and on the surface of the moon—they committed themselves and this nation to God.

When our founding fathers set down the principles of equality, liberty, and justice for all, they bit off a great deal! With such an ambitious and unique agenda, it should not be surprising that two-hundred years later there are still major areas of unfinished business. We need not apologize, or make excuses, but we ought to recognize that there is unfinished business. There are challenges of morality and responsibility in leadership, challenges regarding the stability and future of the American family, challenges of equal justice for all, challenges of secure economic opportunity and a share of free enterprise for all, challenges in regard to dignity and security for senior citizens, challenges of living together in peace and brotherhood, and the great challenge of our cities.

You know, I've always had difficulty singing the last verse of "America, The Beautiful" which says: "O beautiful for patriot dream that sees beyond the years, thine alabaster cities gleam, undimmed by human tears!" I know whoever wrote that song never had their feet on the streets of the South Bronx, or in the core of Milwaukee, for that matter! It's a dream, but the business of the American dream is unfinished!

What about the native American? Maybe you saw the cartoon where a guy is asking an American Indian, "How do you people celebrate the Bicentennial?" And the Indian replies, "About the way you celebrate Pearl Harbor." How would you feel if you went home and found me visiting in your living room, making myself at home, and I tell you that I've "discovered" your home! Unfinished business.

It's this kind of unfinished business, loose human ends on a grand agenda of democracy, that have the potential for bringing down the whole dream. If we are going to meet these challenges over the next one hundred years, then the Bicentennial celebration has got to be more than a contest to see who can make the most unusual birthday cake or the largest flag. There must be a clarion call to repentance and a positive, vital, exciting faith in God!

I find that clarion call in the words of the Lord to King Solomon: "If my people who are called by my name (the Christian people of this land) humble themselves, and pray and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land." This isn't addressed to every citizen on the street but to Christians, Christians who've followed after the Siren song of Madison Avenue, who've gone after the cultural god of materialism, and who've forgotten the faith—the gut faith—of their fathers. This is addressed to Christians who have neglected to be the salt that makes life here tolerable, the leaven for change in our society, and the light of the world. You see, it isn't enough just to be a Christian; you have to do something about it in terms of changing and transforming society.

I've walked the empty streets of the Communist sector of East Berlin. There are few cars—lots of parking space! There is no graffiti on the walls, no hustle and bustle. There are new impressive-looking though sterile buildings, new apartments for the party faithful. But as you walk through this largely rebuilt city, you see the huge, blackened, stark, deserted, bombed-out remains of the great cathedrals which had existed before the war. They've never been torn down. They've been left to stand as monuments to the futility of religion in a Communist world. They've never been rebuilt, for the free expression of religion is prohibited by the government. And it makes me

think of the words of the Lord to King Solomon, "If you turn aside and forsake my statutes and my commandments which I have set before you, and go and serve other gods and worship them (be it the gods of dialectical materialism or whatever) this house, which I have consecrated to my name, I will cast out of my sight, and will make it a proverb and a byword among all peoples. And at this house, which is exalted, every one passing by will be astonished, and say, 'Why has the Lord done thus to this land and to this house?' Then they will say (answering their own question), 'Because they forsook the Lord the God of their fathers who brought them out of the land of Egypt, and laid hold on other gods, and worshipped them and served them; therefore he has brought all this evil upon them.'" (2 Chronicles 7:19-23)

#### COME HOME, AMERICA!

It's time to come home, America! Come home, America, to the fundamentals of faith that formed the bedrock of your dream! Come home, America!

Come home, America, to the concept of the family that was the strong, basic unit of the society that made you great! Come home, America!

Come home, America, to the dream of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all Americans regardless of race, color, creed, country of origin, IQ, age, or sex. Come home, America!

Come home, America, and provide true and equal justice for all, including native Americans, including poor blacks and Latinos languishing for months in city jails without trial because they are poor! Come home, America!

Come home, America, and set free the slaves of welfare and let them work and live in dignity! Come home, America!

Come home, America, and live together in peace, harmony, and respect. Come home to the cities of your birth, the cities that made you great, and make them places of peace, justice, and beauty. Then every man will sit under his vine and under his tree and on his front stoop and none shall make them afraid. Come home, America!

Come home, America, and rise up and live out the purpose of your proclamation! Come home, America!

Come home, America, and become ONE nation, under God!

Then this nation will have a new birth of freedom!

Then justice shall roll down like waters and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.

Then music will swell the breeze and ring from all the trees sweet freedom's song from the redwoods of California to the poplars of New York!

Then the rocks will break their silence, the hills will sing, and from every mountainside freedom will ring!

#### WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA?

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this Bicentennial Year has been a prolific period for commentary about our Nation and properly so—for we have sound reason to stick out our collective chests.

Among some of the literature to come across my desk within the past year was a positive little treatise in book form entitled, "What's Right With America,"

written by Dwight Bohmbach, a retired Bozell and Jacobs International, Inc., advertising executive now residing in Arizona. Mr. Bohmbach's commentary runs the gamut in a stock-taking exercise that makes one feel a real sense of pride in how much has been done for and by so many in such a short period of time. He delves into topics such as our people, the way we live, our occupations, our immigrants, our kids, our benevolence to other less fortunate and even politicians.

For those who are prone to overlook the wonders of this land and concentrate on its frailties, I commend this book as a reminder of what is right with America.

#### HEW AUDIT REPORT ON SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION OF SSI PROGRAM: HOW NOT TO LAUNCH A MAJOR SOCIAL PROGRAM

**HON. CHARLES A. VANIK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, for the past year, the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee has been studying the administration by Social Security of the supplemental security income program for the aged, blind, and disabled. The SSI program was enacted by Public Law 92-603 at the end of October 1972. It became effective 14 months later, in January 1974.

The beginning of the program was marred by massive confusion, inaccurate payments, improper denials of benefits, and unacceptable delays in the processing of claims. While the administration of the program has been getting better during the past 30 months, the case error rate is still approximately 24 percent and improper and inaccurate payments are all too common.

Because of the chaos which accompanied the start of SSI, the HEW Audit Agency—an inspector general type unit separate from the Social Security Administration—has conducted an exhaustive study of the SSI program in various States, in the 10 Social Security Regional Offices, and at the Central Office—Baltimore—headquarters of Social Security, covering the first 6 months of the SSI program—January through June 1974.

The Audit Agency's report has just been released and is a chronicle of massive confusion and unpreparedness at Social Security headquarters: It is a litany of how not to begin a major new social program.

It is important that we learn from the mistakes which accompanied the start of the SSI program, because during the next administration, it appears that a major effort will be made in the area of health and welfare programs. Only if we learn from the mistakes of the SSI program will we be able to launch these new programs with a minimum of confusion and waste.

According to the Department of HEW the scope of their audit was to determine whether:

First, the payment information for recipients was properly prepared, accurately recorded on accounting records, and accurately reported to the States;

Second, automated and manual transactions were processed properly and timely; and

Third, sufficient supervision and controls were in effect to preclude the possibility of fictitious or unauthorized claims from entering the system.

The HEW Audit Agency has determined that, compounded with the magnitude of the new system, the problems were frequent and conflicting changes in policy and operational instruction, as well as last minute changes in the governing legislation. The Audit Agency stated:

Our report addresses financial accountability during a period when SSA was beset by major operational problems. Primary emphasis was given by SSA to correcting problems that affected the delivery of benefit checks to needy recipients and fund accountability was not always of equal concern. Our review showed that program administration was further complicated by weaknesses in financial policies and procedures that affected the accuracy of benefit payments and the reliability of financial data. Timely action to solve accounting problems was hampered by the fragmentation of responsibility within SSA for accounting and related computer systems. Breakdowns occurred in both the originally designed computerized systems and subsequently designed combinations of computerized and manual accounting systems. Accounting data produced by the systems was neither complete nor sufficiently accurate to fully meet the needs of SSA for managing the SSI program, or the desires of the States for financial data on payments made. Policies and procedures governing computer operations did not ensure the operation of effective internal controls to prevent the processing of erroneous data. Additional and continuing emphasis needs to be placed on improving fund accountability in the SSI program.

To illustrate the necessity for reform, for the period January-June 1974, only Hawaii and Louisiana advanced sufficient funds to cover supplementation benefits made by Social Security on their behalf. The final SSA records showed a "net deficit" of \$74.9 million due from the remaining 29 States. According to the SSA, approximately 50 percent of this deficit was due to the unsettled disputes between SSA and the States on the calculation of State liability limitations. As another example of accounting confusion, one-time or emergency payments for the 1974 fiscal year had errors totaling \$21.9 million because of purely informational errors, and at the close of the fiscal year, \$2.5 million had not even been accounted for. These errors were caused by:

First, errors in the transmittal of data from district offices resulting in the rejection of the data by the central computer;

Second, the data was not processed timely;

Third, district offices did not input the data; and,

Fourth, supplemental security records—SSR—did not exist for all individuals who received one-time payments.

These errors as well as others could have been avoided if procedural care in the processing of the data was implemented.

The following points are recommendations by the HEW Audit Agency for the improvement of the SSI program:

1. place the responsibility for SSI accounting policies and procedures into a single organization;

2. revise the SSI computer system to record all disbursements and credits on the SSR and to establish codes for all records on the SSR;

3. establish internal controls at district offices to ensure that all transactions are recorded as they occur;

4. pending use of the SSR as a record of all transactions, monthly reconciliations of transactions, Treasury reports, and amounts being developed though various accounting subsystems must be provided;

5. revise the Financial Accountability Statement so that it becomes meaningful to each State; and,

6. provide for better computer controls over all programs.

I am deeply concerned that our oversight hearings have revealed that many of the problems identified by the Audit Agency as existing during the first 6 months of the program continue to exist: computer operations are still woefully inadequate; error rates are still excessive; communications with the States are still inaccurate.

The Oversight Subcommittee plans additional hearings on the SSI program in the hope that we can obtain improvements in its operation and, even more importantly, that we can provide the Congress with a blueprint of how large, new social programs can best be implemented.

LEWIS DESCHLER

**HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on few occasions in the history of the House of Representatives has any man achieved such distinction through his service to this body that he came to be regarded, in effect, as part of the institution itself. Such a man was Lewis Deschler, whose untiring dedication as Parliamentarian of the House spanned a period of more than four decades.

Lew was here at the Speaker's side well before any of the present Members had been elected to the House. Over the years, he gave expert advice to successive Speakers and House leaders and to rank and file Members who requested it.

Lew's wise counsel was constantly sought by Members. He was at hand and available, he was responsive to inquiries from any of us, he was patient and courteous, and he imparted a sense of calmness and sureness in complicated parliamentary situations.



I remember meeting Lew when I was a freshman Member more than 30 years ago. As time went on, and my legislative responsibilities grew, I came to rely on him increasingly. I will always be grateful for his assistance.

We will miss Lew. I extend deepest condolences to his family.

# LIBRARY OF CONGRESS: THE NATION'S STOREHOUSE OF KNOWLEDGE

## HON. RICHARD F. VANDER VEEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article by Steve Spilos, a member of the Detroit, Mich., Great Lakes and U.S. Capitol Historical Societies, in the Legal Advertiser, a Detroit paper, on the importance of the Library of Congress in our civilization and the contribution made to it by Michigan men including Congressman NEDZI, and the mural painter, Julius Melchers.

The article follows:

### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS: THE NATION'S STOREHOUSE OF KNOWLEDGE (By Steve Spilos)

When Daniel J. Boorstin, the 12th Librarian of Congress, was sworn in November 12, 1975, the President of the United States—Gerald R. Ford—attended the ceremony and in this dramatic way expressed his support of the Library and the great work it is doing.

This was the first time a president had so personally done this.

On behalf of 4,600 fellow workers and all whose creative energies have made the Library of Congress a "well-spring of freedom," Dr. Boorstin thanked the president and praised his distinguished predecessor, L. Quincy Mumford, "who ushered our great Library into the age of automation."

And he particularly recalled the recent visit of Ira Gershwin who was moved to call the Library "a shining star and inspiration, worthy of a mighty nation."

Dr. Boorstin's tribute took in "the power of the machine—the new techniques of photography and sound recording . . . the continued output of the printing presses . . . and by lucky coincidence, the electronic computer that helped save us from being buried under our own treasures."

Dr. Boorstin was on the faculty, where he taught English and American history and literature, and also legal history at the Harvard Law School. A Rhodes Scholar, he attended Balliol College, Oxford, passed the English bar examination, was "called" to the bar and became a Barrister-at-law in 1937. He is one of the few Americans qualified to plead in Her Majesty's Courts.

Michigan men have played an important role in the continued development of the Library of Congress. During the swearing-in ceremony, Congressman Lucien N. Nedzi sat next to Dr. Boorstin. He was there in his official capacity as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library.

When the Main Building was completed in 1897, an internationally known artist, Julius Garibaldi Melchers, of Detroit, painted the two murals, War and Peace, in the Hispanic Society Room. This was his favorite theme, advanced from his earlier work at the Chicago World's Fair.

To see the murals I followed Brian Willson, the Library's tour coordinator, into the Hispanic Room. He stopped in the center of the room and studied the ceiling which had been lowered to accommodate the Congressional Research Service Department. Finally, he reached up, tilted a panel and exposed a lofty dome—and Gari Melchers' work, on either end of the room.

"Speaking of Michigan," Willson said, "you should see our Walt Whitman collection, a contribution of Detroit's Charles E. Feinberg, who is an honorary consultant of the Library. It is the most extensive one of its kind."

More than 800 people work in the research department which spills over into the balcony, corridors and wings of the gallery, visible proof the Library is just that—a Library of Congress. Researchers answer some fifteen hundred queries from Congress each day. Emergency material is expedited through a large vacuum tube direct to Capitol Hill, and sometimes to the very floors of the House or Senate.

The Library had its start in 1800—when Congress authorized the purchase in London of 600 British law books—and survived two major fires, one during the War of 1812 when the British burned the capital.

Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, gave it impetus when he said, "A member of the legislature should be informed on all subjects if he is to vote intelligently."

From the balcony overlooking the Main Reading Room, now one of fourteen in the Library, we passed the overloaded stack areas on the way to the Mezzanine, where the journals of the Continental Congress since 1774, Congressional records, bills and official documents of the House and Senate are kept.

Obviously, the Library is cramped for space, but the opening of the new James Madison Memorial addition will double its capacity.

Willson enjoys his work—visitors from everywhere tour the library. He is a tall, dignified person with a finely-trimmed moustache and British accent. He served seven years in the English army during World War II.

"We don't believe everything important is in English," he said, "and provide world-wide service. In many instances, foreign scholars find more books here—in their own language—than they do at home."

Having just returned from Mt. Athos in northern Greece, I was surprised to learn rare books and manuscripts from the Holy Mountain are preserved on microfilm in the Library.

The Library collections are very extensive and universal in scope, totaling more than 75 million items and 16 million books and pamphlets on every subject and in a multitude of languages. Only one other library in the world can come close and that is the Lenin Library in Moscow.

Extension services are very broad and include "talking books" for the blind in 34 regional library centers. Copyright service was introduced in 1870 and comes under the control of the Librarian of Congress.

If you were to ask what the Library excels in, the answer would have to be the law. This is where the concentration has been. Established by an act of Congress in 1832, as a department of the Library of Congress, the Law Library originally contained 2,017 volumes, 639 of which had been part of the Thomas Jefferson library. Now it houses more than a million and a half titles.

The Library of Congress has the world's largest collection of published aeronautical literature and the most extensive collection of incunabula—early or primitive works of art and manufacture—in the United States. A Brazilian collection includes 33 woodcuts reproduced from their literature de cordel or

"string literature." The name is derived from the custom of displaying chapbooks for sale on strings from a pole.

Manuscript collections relate to American history and civilization, music, maps and views, recordings, speeches, poetry readings, prints and drawings and periodicals from all over the world.

By far the greatest treasure in the Library is the Mazarin Bible, printed in Germany about 1455 by Johann Gutenberg. It is displayed in the Great Hall right next to the Great Bible of Mainz and is the earliest book printed by movable type.

Some books in the Library were obtained for practically no cost at all and now are priceless. A good example is the Bay Psalm Book, 1640—the first book printed in America.

An intricate series of metal lifts and baskets, carts and pneumatic tubes reduce walking in the Library to a minimum, except in the uphill tunnel that connects the Library Annex to the Main Building. Completed in 1939, the five-story annex which actually has more space than the main library was recently renamed in honor of Thomas Jefferson.

Near the front exit there is an information desk with an affable attendant and some books to browse through while you wait for a cab. To my pleasant surprise I found a gem—"Viewpoints," a recent publication of the Library.

A pictorial history, it features selected photos from the Detroit Publishing Company's fabulous collection of 50,000 prints and plate-glass negatives which are now a part of the Library. It is pure Americana—and another great contribution from Michigan to the library of libraries, the Library of Congress.

## NATIONAL WHEELCHAIR GAMES

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, organized wheelchair athletics have been increasingly used in this country, and abroad, as a successful aid toward rehabilitating the handicapped. I recently had the privilege of attending the 20th National Wheelchair Games held on June 13, at Farmingdale, N.Y. These games are held annually as trials for the Paralympics, an international athletic competition for paraplegics, modeled on the regular Olympic Games.

I would like to thank Mr. Benjamin Lipton, chairman of the United States National Wheelchair Athletic Association, Dr. Charles Laffin, president of the State University of New York at Farmingdale, and Mr. Harold Unterberg for the fine work they have done with this program and for inviting me to attend the games.

These competitions benefit the participants in a variety of ways. The handicapped person's success at athletic competition greatly increases his self-confidence and serves to make him aware of his capabilities for successful employment. These people gain greater motivation to become contributing members of society and often participate in other programs, such as community services, in addition to earning good incomes at full-time jobs. This increased motivation and psychological lift that

the handicapped achieve through athletic competition also contributes to their physical well-being, and they require less attention from medical personnel.

The coverage given the wheelchair competitions by the various news media has also benefited the handicapped by educating the general public about their courage and capabilities. This has led to more public support for these people to become productive members of society, and has dispelled the myth that paraplegics are a burden to society. News coverage of these games also serves to make other handicapped people aware of their potential and gives them greater hope for their own development and rehabilitation. Other groups of different types of handicapped people may also be induced to develop programs of athletic competition through witnessing the success of the wheelchair games.

I heartily commend the work being done in the area of athletic competition for handicapped persons on both the national and international level. These programs deserve much public recognition and the participants deserve a great deal of encouragement and praise for their determined and successful efforts to overcome the limitations of their handicap and prove themselves valuable members of society.

#### "A BILL TO END SCHOOL BUSING"

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1976, I introduced H.R. 12365, a bill to eliminate Federal court jurisdiction over forced school attendance, the text of which is:

That, pursuant to article III, sections 1 and 2, of the United States Constitution, no court of the United States shall have the jurisdiction to make any decision, or issue any order, which would have the effect of requiring any individual to attend any particular school.

On May 10, 1976, after the Judiciary Committee indicated it plans to take no action on this bill, I initiated a discharge petition which is now available for signature by Members at the Journal Clerk's desk on the House floor.

The purpose of the bill is to prohibit Federal court orders forcing children to attend a particular school, such as orders to bus children to specified schools because of their race. Its means is to employ the authority granted to Congress by article III of the Constitution to restrict the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to issue such orders.

Frankly, it is surprising there are still proponents of school busing for the purpose of achieving racial balance. It is costly, it is driving down the quality of education and it is apparently resulting in greater segregation, the very opposite of its alleged purpose.

Even sociology Prof. James Coleman, the author of the influential 1966 study

used as a basis of many busing orders, now says court-ordered school integration is a failure. A new study by Coleman shows that court ordered integration results in a "general resegregation in all regions of the country." It is worth noting that in an interview published last year in the National Observer, Coleman called the courts "the worst of all possible instruments for carrying out a very sensitive activity like integrating schools."

#### BUSING FOSTERS RACISM

But by far its most pernicious aspect is the effect on the children who are caught up in it. Racism is a crude form of collectivism: It consists of treating people as members of racial groups instead of as individuals based on their own qualities of character. And what is a young person taught when he is uprooted from his school and friends and forced to attend some distant school, and told that the reason is his race? Thus are the seeds of racism planted in young and impressionable minds.

And thus it is no wonder that busing always increases racial awareness and racial tensions, resulting in turmoil and fighting among students paired off on the basis of their race. If we wish to attack racism among our young people, we must eliminate race as a standard for determining anything. Which means we must eliminate Government-imposed quotas, affirmative actions, et cetera. And the first to go should be one of the most insidious: assignment of children to various schools on the basis of their race.

FROM BROWN TO GREEN: THE SWITCH FROM NONRACIAL TO RACIAL SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT

But to eliminate this we must curb its chief source: The Federal courts. Some of these courts are now holding that busing is necessary to remedy violations of the constitutional right to the equal protection of the law under the 14th amendment.

Consider, however, the history of desegregation decisions dating back to *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954). In that case the Court held that the state policies requiring the separation of students in the public schools on the basis of race violated the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, thus overturning the "separate but equal" doctrine established in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1895). The Court, in the words of Chief Justice Earl Warren, stated:

"The fundamental principle that racial discrimination in public education is unconstitutional."

And held that—

"All provisions of federal, state, or local law requiring or permitting such discrimination must yield to this principle." (emphasis added)

In discussing appropriate remedies, Chief Justice Warren further stated:

"At stake is the personal interest of the plaintiffs in admission to public schools as soon as practicable on a nondiscriminatory basis", and, "the courts may consider . . . revision of school districts and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis . . ." (emphasis added)

I am not sure how the Supreme Court could have been more explicit—racial discrimination in public education is ruled unconstitutional and admission to the public schools must be on a nonracial basis. And yet a series of Federal court decisions over a period of years have resulted in exactly the opposite—the ordering of children to attend certain schools because of their race.

At first the Court declined to interfere with the administration of its Brown mandate, allowing the enactment and administration of "pupil placement laws" assigning each student to a school on the basis of formally nondiscriminatory criteria. Eventually, however, the lower courts began voiding these laws on the grounds of discriminatory application and in the early 1960's various State practices such as school closings, minority transfer plans, and zoning were ruled inadmissible. What followed is well summarized on page 1498 of "The Constitution of the United States," Senate Document 92-82:

About this time, "freedom of choice" plans were promulgated under which each child in the school district could choose each year which school he wished to attend and subject to space limitations he could attend that school. These were first approved by the lower courts as acceptable means to implement desegregation, subject to the reservations that they be fairly administered.

However—

Enactment of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and HEW enforcement in a manner as to require effective implementation of affirmative actions to desegregate led to a change of attitude in the lower courts and to a three-case decision in the Supreme Court posited on the principle that the only desegregation plan permissible is one which actually results in the abolition of the dual school and charging school officials with an affirmative obligation to achieve it.

The crucial case was *Green v. County Board of Education*, 391 U.S. 430 (1968), in which the Court declared that State and local authorities have an "affirmative duty" to abolish the effects of former discriminatory practices.

Notice the switch, the change from eliminating discrimination on the basis of race to requiring it. Traditionally the test of violation of the equal protection clause has been whether segregation is de jure—that is, the result of intentional action of school officials—or de facto—resulting from factors other than the application of the law by State and local officials—neighborhood residential patterns, for example.

But as the courts began to rule on the various plans of school districts to eliminate racial discrimination, they increasingly expanded the scope of de jure segregation until it included virtually any schools not containing a "proper" ratio of black and white students. Thus it became virtually impossible for school officials to come up with any plan of student assignment that would not be ruled a case of de jure segregation.

Now the obvious solution is the "freedom of choice" plan that many school systems attempted to implement. If a student is given the freedom to choose which school to attend, clearly he is not being discriminated against because of his race; however, when the courts began



disallowing such plans and requiring "affirmative action" instead, they made it impossible to implement the Brown mandate to eliminate racial discrimination from our public schools—there is simply no way to pursue an "affirmative duty" without making race the standard of school assignment.

This was made clear by the subsequent Court ruling in *Swann v. Board of Education*, 402 U.S. 1 (1971), in which the Court pointed out that the neighborhood school or any other student assignment plan "is not acceptable simply because it appears to be neutral."

Instead, the Court stated that—

Because the present situation may be attributable to past discriminatory actions in site selection and location of school buildings, it is permissible, and may be required, to resort to altering of attendance boundaries and grouping or pairing schools in non-contiguous fashion in order to promote desegregation and undo past official action; in the remedial process, conscious assignment of students and drawing of boundaries on the basis of race is permissible for the moment.

The Swann decision explicitly approved busing of students in this remedial process.

#### BUSING IS DISCRIMINATORY AND ILLEGAL

Two things must be said about this policy of ordering race conscious school assignment to remedy past discrimination. First, discriminating against today's school children in no way corrects past discrimination. No one would advocate that a man's son pay for a crime committed by his father; yet in regard to racial discrimination, many people somehow believe that guilt is collective, is passed on from one generation to the next and that punishing today's children is an appropriate means of atoning for yesterday's sin.

Second, such a policy is illegal. Equal protection of the law is surely not afforded to those children forced to attend a particular school because of their race. In fact this is precisely what the Supreme Court held in the Brown case when it outlawed racial discrimination and ordered admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis. Congress agreed when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 defining "desegregation" as—

... the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but 'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance. (42 USC 2000c)

So what should be done? School busing is illegal and irrational, but the Federal courts continue to order it. One possibility is a constitutional amendment. However, I do not think this is necessary since under any logical interpretation of the law, school busing is already illegal. Besides, such an approach could take many years and thus prolong the injustice.

No, it is clearly the courts that are at fault; it is their illogical and inconsistent interpretation of the law that is the problem, not the actual law.

This is why I chose to introduce legislation to restrict court jurisdiction instead of amending the law. In fact, I believe the possibility of such obvious over-

stepping of bounds by the courts is precisely why the Founding Fathers gave Congress the power to control the courts. Just as the doctrine of judicial review gives the courts a means of checking the power of Congress, the authority to restrict jurisdiction gives Congress a means to check the power of the courts.

#### THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF REGULATING COURT JURISDICTION

The question is raised, however, as to just how far this authority to restrict court jurisdiction extends. Two things are clear: The authority is very broad indeed, but it is not unlimited.

The Constitution, article III, sections 1 and 2, explicitly grants Congress the power to control the courts: With respect to the Supreme Court, by regulating its appellate jurisdiction; with respect to the inferior federal courts, by establishing them in the first place and thus regulating both their original and appellate jurisdiction.

The Supreme Court has upheld the right of Congress to control its appellate jurisdiction in a number of cases. "By the constitution of the United States," the Court held in *Barry v. Mercein*, 5 How. (46 U.S.) 103, 119 (1847), "the Supreme Court possesses no appellate power in any case, unless conferred upon it by act of Congress." And in *Daniels v. Railroad Co.*, 3 Wall. (70 U.S.) 250, 254 (1865), the Court said that in order for a case to come within its appellate jurisdiction—

Two things must occur: The Constitution must give the capacity to take it, and an act of Congress must supply the requisite authority.

In the same case, the Court also stated:

It is for Congress to determine how far, within the limits of the capacity of this court to take, appellate jurisdiction shall be given, and when conferred, it can be exercised only to the extent and in the manner prescribed by law. In these respects it is wholly the creature of legislation.

Perhaps the most explicit statement in support of Congress authority to restrict appellate jurisdiction came in *Ex parte McCordle*. In this case—

The Court accepted review on certiorari of a denial of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus by the circuit court; the petition was by a civilian convicted by a military commission of acts obstructing Reconstruction. Anticipating that the Court might void, or at least undermine, congressional reconstruction of the Confederate States, Congress enacted over the President's veto a provision repealing the act which authorized the appeal *McCordle* had taken. Although the Court had already heard argument on the merits, it then dismissed for want of jurisdiction. "We are not at liberty to inquire into the motives of the legislature. We can only examine into its power under the Constitution; and the power to make exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of this court is given by express words." (*The Constitution*, page 752)

Likewise there are a number of decisions in which the Court has upheld the power of Congress to regulate the jurisdiction of the inferior courts, on the basis that they owe their very existence to Congress in the Judiciary Act of 1789. For example, in *Turner against Bank of North America*, the issue involved the jurisdiction of the Federal courts when a suit was brought to a Federal court under

its diversity jurisdiction, an action prohibited by the Judiciary Act of 1789. The defense counsel argued that the grant of judicial power by the Constitution was a direct grant of jurisdiction, but the court disagreed:

The notion has frequently been entertained, that the federal courts derive their judicial power immediately from the constitution; but the political truth is, that the disposal of the judicial power (except in a few specified instances) belongs to Congress. If Congress has given the power to this Court, we possess it, not otherwise: and if Congress has not given the power to us, or to any other Court, it still remains at the legislative disposal. Besides, Congress is not bound, and it would, perhaps, be inexpedient, to enlarge the jurisdiction of the federal courts, to every subject, in every form, which the constitution might warrant. 4 Dall. (4 U.S.) 8 (1799)

Even the father of judicial review, Chief Justice Marshall, held the same view, observing in *Ex parte Bollman*, 4 Cr. (8, 10) (1799), that "courts which are created by written law, and whose jurisdiction is defined by written law, cannot transcend that jurisdiction."

More recent Court decisions have also supported this principle. For example, in 1932 Congress enacted the Norris-La Guardia Act, prohibiting the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes except by compliance with a lengthy hearing and factfinding process, which was challenged in court on jurisdictional grounds. The law was upheld in *Lauf v. Skinner & Co.*, 303 U.S. 323, 330 (1938), however, herein the Court declared:

There can be no question of the power of Congress to thus define and limit the jurisdiction of the inferior courts of the United States.

The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, in which Congress provided for a special court to handle challenges to the validity of price regulations, was another clear-cut example of congressional restriction of Federal inferior court jurisdiction. The basic constitutionality of this act was upheld in *Lockerty v. Phillips*, 319 U.S. 182 (1943), while in *Yakus v. United States*, 321 U.S. 414 (1944), the Court held that the act's removal of the district court's jurisdiction to examine the constitutional validity of regulations was not a denial of due process.

#### THE LIMITS OF CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY TO CONTROL THE COURTS

Clearly the power of Congress to control the federal courts through regulating their jurisdiction is very broad indeed. Nevertheless it is not without limits. For if it were, if Congress could withdraw federal court jurisdiction over literally any matter it chooses, then obviously basic constitutional foundations such as express prohibitions, separation of powers, and the nature of the judicial function could be overturned by congressional whim.

What these limits are precisely is not so obvious; however, an examination of *Ex parte McCordle* provides some guidance. This case is most significant because the court held that Congress has the authority to legislatively restrict court jurisdiction over writs of habeas corpus, even though habeas corpus is a

right expressly granted by article I, section 9 of the Constitution, and thus it marks perhaps the furthest advance by Congress over court jurisdiction. However, even in that case there were limits, as the Court observed in concluding its opinion:

Counsel seem to have supposed, if effect be given to the repealing act in question, that the whole appellate power of the court, in cases of *habeas corpus*, is denied. But this is an error. The act of 1868 does not except from that jurisdiction any cases but appeals from Circuit Courts under the act of 1867. It does not affect the jurisdiction which was previously exercised. *The Constitution*, pages

So what may we deduce regarding the limits of congressional power to control the Federal courts by regulating their jurisdiction? I believe it can be summarized as follows:

First. The power of Congress to control the inferior federal courts is virtually unlimited. This power is expressly granted by the Constitution when it authorizes Congress to establish inferior courts, which Congress did by the Judiciary Act of 1789, and has been upheld consistently by numerous Court decisions.

Second. The power of Congress to control the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court with respect to statutory questions is likewise virtually unlimited. This power is expressly granted by the Constitution and has been upheld by numerous Court decisions.

Third. The power of Congress to control the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court with respect to constitutional questions is not unlimited. Although the Constitution explicitly grants such power to Congress, it could not validly be used to undermine the very purpose and foundation of the Constitution itself. Thus the Congress does not have the power to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court if its effect would be to infringe on the separation of power or to prohibit the Court from exercising its judicial functions in protecting rights granted by the various express prohibitions on Government power enumerated in the Constitution.

#### THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF H.R. 12365

So what about H.R. 12365? Well if this bill restricted Federal court jurisdiction with respect to freedom of speech or with respect to the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, it would be unconstitutional—at least in regards to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. But it does not. It restricts Federal court jurisdiction with respect to school attendance; specifically, it prohibits the courts from requiring any individual to attend any particular school.

Now since education is not mentioned in the Constitution and public education has been created by statute, restricting court jurisdiction with respect to school attendance does not ostensibly raise a constitutional question. However, the question of constitutionality might be raised in desegregation cases under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. But it is important to keep in mind precisely what jurisdiction H.R. 12365 restricts. It does not prohibit the Federal courts from hearing cases dealing with school desegregation. What it

does, in effect, is deny to the courts the ability to order what some courts have alleged to be remedies in such cases.

It still allows the Federal courts to hear such cases and to order any remedial action they consider appropriate, except for those remedies which involve forced school attendance—particularly forced school attendance on the basis of an individual's race. The courts would have jurisdiction, for instance, to require school attendance plans based on freedom of choice, which would be consistent with the Brown decision, the equal protection clause and the Civil Rights Act; they would not have jurisdiction, however, to order school attendance plans requiring school assignment on the basis of one's race—plans which are not consistent with Brown, the equal protection clause or the Civil Rights Act.

It may be argued that offering freedom of choice plans as remedies for segregated schools is inappropriate on legal grounds because of the doctrine of stare decisis—which holds that courts should follow the rules or principles laid down in previous judicial decisions unless they contravene the ordinary principles of justice—since such plans have already been struck down in some court decisions. But it is the principle established by such decisions—that “affirmative action” must be taken to desegregate schools and thus that children must be assigned to schools on the basis of their race—which is not consistent with the Brown decision. Thus while overturning earlier decisions disallowing freedom of choice plans may appear to be a violation of stare decisis, in fact such action would merely bring remedies in line with the principle of nonracial school assignment established by Brown.

It should also be noted that stare decisis, while serving a valid judicial function, is by no means an ironclad rule, particularly in cases dealing with constitutional issues. Its limitations have been progressively weakened since Pollock against Farmers' Loan and Trust Co. in 1895, since which some 143 decisions have overturned one or more earlier decisions of constitutional questions (op. cit., page 683). Brown, of course, is itself one of the most famous instances of an established doctrine being overturned.

Nevertheless, I am often told, even though H.R. 12365 is constitutional and forced bussing is contrary to the equal protection clause and the Civil Rights Act, the courts might still declare the bill unconstitutional. After all, if they order something obviously contrary to the law as forced bussing, what is to stop them from ignoring the constitutional basis of H.R. 12365?

The answer is that irrationality on the part of Federal judges is no reason for Congress to abdicate its responsibility to uphold the Constitution. The emphasis placed on the issue by enactment of a bill like H.R. 12365 could go a long way toward influencing the courts; at the very least it would force them to review their arguments which, given their obvious shortcomings, could lead to a reversal of some of their more extreme decisions. In fact, I believe many judges

are looking for a means to get out from under the havoc they have brought about, and legislation restricting their jurisdiction could well be a vehicle they would readily climb aboard.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in signing the discharge petition. In terms of fostering race consciousness, in disrupting the lives of our young people and interfering with their education, forced school busing is exacting an enormous price. I believe restricting the jurisdiction of the Federal courts is the fastest and surest way of eliminating this.

#### HOST NATION CANADA BETRAYS 21ST OLYMPIAD

#### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker—

I would like to assure you that all parties representing the National Olympic Committees and National Sports Federation recognized by the International Olympic Committee will be free to enter Canada pursuant to the normal regulations.

So wrote the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs on November 28, 1969, in a letter to the International Olympic Committee. This letter was sent in conjunction with the submission of a bid by the city of Montreal to be the host nation for the summer Olympic games, a bid which was ultimately accepted, due in part, to the assurances made in this letter.

As we all know from the events of the past week, Canada has demonstrated to the entire world that her word is meaningless, that she is not beneath engaging in international deception, and, above all, as a host nation she has chosen to inject politics into the Olympics, threatening the very integrity of the games.

I note with great concern actions taken by Canada to ban the Republic of China from competing in the 21st Olympic games. Canadian Government officials will contend that they did not ban Taiwan from the games, that, rather, Taiwan voluntarily withdrew. Instead of engaging in a game of semantics, let us look at the simple facts. Canada prohibited Taiwan from competing under the name of the Republic of China, although this is the name they were officially registered under, with the IOC. Rather than be a party to this indignation, the Government of Taiwan pulled its athletes out of the games, an understandable action, by anyone's standards.

The efforts of Canada to inject politics into the Olympics is reprehensible and should be condemned by all nations. The Olympics symbolize the pinnacle of international sports competition. It is an opportunity for the finest athletes from all nations to come together and compete. For athletes who are selected to compete, it represents a high personal honor. It is an honor which is well earned, usually after many years of intensive and oftentimes lonely training.



The Olympic athletes seek to bring pride to their nations as well as to themselves. Yet, for the athletes of Taiwan, one foolish act of political expediency by the Canadian Government has effectively destroyed the years of training which brought them to the Olympics. It is an unconscionable loss to all athletes, no matter what nation they represent. The winners and losers of the Olympics should be determined in the sports, and not the political arena.

It is particularly regrettable that Canada has chosen to indulge in such cheap political gimmickry when she had such an excellent honor bestowed upon her as a host nation for the summer Olympics. The worst part about this entire episode is that it is so obvious that Canada did not take this action purely on her own initiative. In reality, Canada finds herself in the ignominious position of being a pawn in the hands of the People's Republic of China, which has demonstrated to the world that she can still impose her will without firing a shot. But the actions of Canada may have dealt a fatal blow to the future of the Olympic games.

Canada's integrity as a nation has been seriously damaged by her actions. It is ironic to note that this same nation, while being so adamantly opposed to allowing the nation of Taiwan to compete, has voiced no objections to permitting the Palestine Liberation Organization from participating in a United Nations Conference recently held in Vancouver.

Transcending the political morality lacking in this situation, are the consequences the Canadian action is having on current participants in the Olympic games. An atmosphere of tension and ill will has been created for these games. The athletes now realize that it is as much political muscle as athletic talent which is important for the Olympics.

To a degree, our Nation shares some of the blame for its failure to come to the aid of Taiwan. Our threats to pull out of the games were inexcusable, not only to our own athletes, but to Taiwan as well. Both this Nation and the International Olympic Committee had indications well before hand, that Canada might engage in this type of action. And, at that time, we should have supported a revocation of Canada's hosting privileges for the Olympics. Even if the games had to be postponed, it surely would have been preferable to what we have now; games which are tainted by cheap politics and which do not permit athletes from all nations to engage in this prestigious and honorable competition.

There is no room for politics in the Olympics, especially when it is the host nation indulging in it. I deplore Canada's actions in this matter and hold them solely responsible for damaging the integrity of the 21st Olympiad. It is my fervent hope that the damage they have done will not be lasting, as this Nation looks forward to its own opportunity to host the 1980 winter Olympic games. I do wish the American athletes well in the competition. I extend my condolences to the fine athletes of Taiwan and hope that their ability to com-

pete in the Olympics will never again be sacrificed to accommodate political ends.

#### CLEVELAND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER DETERMINED TO IMPROVE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives the outstanding achievements of Ms. Berthina Palmer.

As chairman of the education committee of the Cleveland Board of Education, this dynamic woman has taken a leadership role in improving the educational and career opportunities for our young people.

As you will read in the following account, Ms. Palmer has also shown great perseverance and determination in achieving her own stated goals and aspirations. She is truly a positive role-model for Cleveland youngsters.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you the following article, written by reporter Mildred Raushchold, which appeared in the June 3, 1976 edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 3, 1976]

#### SCHOOLS GET DOSE OF GOAL POWER

(By Mildred Raushchold)

When it comes to the subject of goals, Berthina E. Palmer is as determined as a quarterback.

"If only I could get across to children the fact that if they are determined to win in this world today, they often must do several objective things at one time—then I would be extremely happy."

That philosophy helped Miss Palmer beat the odds in her own quest for education, and now, as a member of the Cleveland Board of Education, she is trying to make it work for others.

For 30 years Miss Palmer has been a secretary in the office of the Cleveland AFL-CIO Federation of Labor (CFL).

And, while she worked there full-time, she managed to study and fulfill her dream of graduating from college—not with one degree, but two.

"I came to work as a secretary right after I was graduated from John Hay High School," Miss Palmer said. "It (the job) was really obtained through the aid of the Urban League, which made me realize I was capable of meeting the qualifications."

"I wanted desperately to go to college, so I could teach. But since I was one of seven children, my parents found this impossible. My father had a steady job in the steel mills, but money wasn't too plentiful with a large family to support."

Shortly after Miss Palmer went to work at the CFL office, she was notified she had received a one-year scholarship to Western Reserve University.

She was elated. By juggling her class schedule, she was able to continue to work full-time as a secretary.

When she was one class away from completing a major in education, there came a change of goals, from teaching to law.

"My friends told me I would make a good teacher, but I realized that being a teacher wasn't my bag," Miss Palmer said. "Today I find I can do more as a school board member to make things happen for the children than if I were a teacher."

By attending summer classes and taking various night courses, she was able to obtain two degrees in seven years.

"I was graduated from Western Reserve in 1951 and from Cleveland Marshall School of Law in 1954. It wasn't easy, but it certainly has been worth it."

Although Berthina Palmer is now a member of the school board, she once marched in a protest walk around the Board of Education building. She was determined then—and is now—to bring about change.

Many children are unaware of what is available to them, Miss Palmer said. The schools don't prepare them, and the youngsters don't avail themselves of opportunities. Many of them, she said, come out of school with no idea of what life is all about.

Miss Palmer was appointed to fill a vacancy on the Cleveland Board of Education in 1974, and the electorate returned her to the post last year.

She is chairman of the board's education committee and has made the problems of truancy, discipline and curriculum—especially reading—her special concerns.

Reading disability among pupils troubles her, and she is a strong advocate of improving the school system's programs.

"I will only be happy when every child learns to read," she said.

She is also striving to create a stronger relationship between parents, the community and school officials.

A group of parents who thought no one ever listened to their gripes about the school system found an attentive ear when Miss Palmer called them together recently.

"I was tired of hearing people say they felt as if they were talking to a brick wall and no one listened. I told them this was their chance to have someone listen."

The complaints voiced at that meeting covered every aspect of the school system, from food programs to homework policies.

"I am convinced that groups, such as this one, will grow and be able to work out practical solutions for their problems," Miss Palmer said.

"Sure I get discouraged, but I figure if enough people get together and make known their gripes and complaints, things usually can be worked out."

"Enough people, with the same complaint, joined together, can do wonders."

#### PRESIDENT FORD AT THE CENTENNIAL SAFE OPENING CEREMONY

### HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend with you and many of our other colleagues and distinguished guests the historic Centennial Safe Opening Ceremony in Statuary Hall on Thursday, July 1, 1976.

Mr. Speaker, the address of President Ford on that occasion becomes a part of a memorable record established in connection with our Nation's Bicentennial. Indeed, throughout this period President Ford has uttered words of gratitude and inspiration commemorat-

ing our great heritage and challenging us to achieve even greater goals during the third century of our history as a free and independent nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add to my remarks the address of President Ford at the Centennial Safe Opening Ceremony—and to commend, to those colleagues who were unable to be present and to citizens throughout the Nation and the world, the President's words as an eloquent expression of the spirit and challenge of our American Republic and of freedom-seeking individuals everywhere.

The article follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE CENTENNIAL SAFE OPENING CEREMONY, STATUARY HALL, THE CAPITOL

Senator Mike Mansfield, Mr. Speaker, Senator Scott, Senator Brooke, Congresswoman Boggs, distinguished Members of the House and Senate, ladies and gentlemen:

Obviously, I am deeply honored to have the opportunity this afternoon to open this historic centennial safe. It contains many items of interest to us today as we celebrate the completion of our second century. But, it symbolizes much more than a valuable collection of mementoes—it symbolizes something about the United States of America that is so mighty and so inspiring that it cannot be locked up in a safe. I mean the American spirit.

When this safe was sealed, Americans looked forward to the future, to this year of 1976. There was no doubt in their minds that a President of a free government would participate in a ceremony here in the United States Capitol Building.

Just as American men and women 200 years ago looked to the future, those who sealed this safe 100 years ago also looked to the future.

So it is today with Americans, but there is no safe big enough to contain the hopes, the energies, the abilities of our people. Our real national treasure does not have to be kept under lock and key in a safe or in a vault. America's wealth is not in material objects but in our great heritage, our freedom and our belief in ourselves.

A century ago, the population of the United States numbered over 40 million. Today, we have more than five times as many. But the growth of our population has not lessened our devotion to the principles that inspired Americans in 1776 or 1876.

In 1876, our immense wealth, both natural and inventive, commanded worldwide attention. We grew from coast to coast in greater industrial and agricultural development than humanity had ever known.

In 1876, America was still emerging from a terrible fraternal war. A lesser people might have been unequal to the challenge, but 1976 finds the confidence of 1876 confirmed. Today, there is far greater equality of opportunity, liberty and justice for all of our citizens in every corner of America. There is rising prosperity for our Nation and peace and progress for our people.

We look back to the evening of July 4, 1776. It was then, after the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, that the Continental Congress resolved that Franklin, Adams and Jefferson begin work on a seal as a national symbol. We are all familiar with the front part of that great seal. But the reverse side, which also appears on every dollar bill, is especially instructive. It depicts a pyramid which is not completed and a single eye gazing out radiantly. The unfinished pyramid represents the work that remains for Americans to do. The Latin motto below

is freely translated: "God has favored our undertaking."

Two hundred years later, we know God has. Though we may differ as Americans have throughout the past, we share a common purpose. It is the achievement of the future in keeping with our glorious past. The American Republic provides for continued growth through a convergence of views and interests, but that growth must be spiritual as well as material.

As we look inside this safe, let us look inside ourselves. Let us look into our hearts and into our hopes.

On Sunday, we start a new century, a century of the individual. We have given meaning to our life as a Nation. Let us now welcome a century in which we give new meaning to our lives as individuals. Let us look inside ourselves to unleash the God-given treasures stored within. And let us look outside ourselves to the needs of our families, our friends, our communities, our Nation and our moral and spiritual consciousness.

#### DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FOR AMERICAN AVIATION

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, in the July 1976 issue of Flight Operations magazine, Kendall K. Hoyt, a recognized authority in aviation matters, wrote a "Declaration of Independence for American Aviation." His declaration is both timely and thought-provoking.

In this Bicentennial month, it seems to me that the point in remembering our Nation's past is to assure our future. The future of aviation is not bright, especially as long as the Federal Aviation Administration is dominated lock, stock and barrel by the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Mr. Hoyt agrees with me that legislation needs to be enacted to separate the FAA from DOT. His declaration makes a compelling case for separation, and I commend it to the attention of the Congress and the Nation as follows:

#### BICENTENNIAL AVIATION DECLARATION

We who subscribe to this statement believe that freedom in the world depends on the strength of the United States of America and that air progress, vital to that strength, must run free.

Two centuries ago our nation was founded to prove what freedom could do for mankind.

Aviation is our crowning achievement. It hastened the end of World War II, then kept the peace. It shrank distances so all U.S. areas are closely linked with each other and the world.

Cities are enriched by jet traffic. Smaller towns can reach wide markets and are served in countless ways. Urban crowding is eased. Employment is created. Welfare costs are cut.

The dollar is supported by aviation exports second only to agriculture. Civil flight and the industries it feeds are a ready reserve for war or emergency.

If U.S. leadership is to be kept, aviation must continue to advance.

Obstacles to air progress rather are imposed by our own government with results as dire as if planned by competing nations.

American pride in aviation is soured by

groups that spread exaggerated fears of noise and fumes and ignore the benefits.

Many airport projects for oncoming needs have been delayed or blocked. Our supersonic transport was killed while other nations, friendly and foes, outpace us.

Air carriers are in straits due to rising costs and slow federal actions on routes and rates. Bankruptcy of airlines is threatened by plans to scrap the system that built them.

They cannot buy new planes as bankers fear to lend. Tens of thousands of aircraft workers are idle. New aircraft models lag while other nations prepare to challenge our supremacy in world markets.

For airports and airways, billions in taxes from passengers and planeowners lie in the aviation trust fund while urgent improvements wait.

Airport aid lapsed for a year as Congress failed to renew it. Crippling taxes and fuel restrictions are proposed for general (non-airline) aviation.

Unless these evils are abated, U.S. leadership will wane while far-sighted nations steal our heritage.

For action, aviation depends more on government than any other industry. Twice free, the Federal Aviation Administration was put under the Department of Transportation so all transport would be together.

Though aviation has little relation to other modes aside from airport access, its needs wait behind rail and urban transit.

FAA is under the thumb of DOT bureaucrats without aviation background, delaying or reversing personnel and planning decisions. There is no clear policy for development.

Over DOT, the ever-increasing power of the Office of Management and Budget works against aviation by money impoundment and cuts. Future restraints on growth are contemplated.

The Communist Manifesto of 1848 put all forms of transport under the state. Is this our way?

For immediate reforms, much can be done by a Presidential order setting high priorities and freeing FAA to deal directly with Congress and the Executive Office on budgets and plans.

Beyond that, it is up to Congress to assert that air progress is imperative and to restore independence for FAA to do its task.

We who endorse this statement most earnestly petition that the dynamic force of aviation at once be freed for the future peace and progress of our nation and the world.

#### PRESIDENT FORD HAILS U.S. MASTERY OF AIR-SPACE

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, the Smithsonian Institution's new Air and Space Museum, dedicated on July 1, is fascinating and inspiring in its displays, and also is a superb example of enlightened architecture.

I am tremendously impressed with both the amazing past accomplishments and the promises of the future that are dramatically on view in that beautiful new building.

Americans have always been noted for useful innovation and for technical competence. Our mastery over the hostile realm of outer space provides perhaps



the single most outstanding example of this American genius.

Now, in this month in which we are celebrating the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, it is especially appropriate that we are dedicating a great national museum to our past record of accomplishment in aviation and space flight, and we also are landing spacecraft on Mars, thus giving at the same time extraordinary glimpses of the past and of the future.

President Ford delivered the keynote address at the dedication of the Air and Space Museum, and it is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the President's remarks there should be preserved in our Record.

Thus for the benefit of our colleagues and those of our constituents who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I insert at this point the full text of the President's very significant remarks as follows:

Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Vice President, distinguished Members of Congress, Secretary Ripley, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

This beautiful new museum and its exciting exhibits of the mastery of air and space is a perfect birthday present from the American people to themselves. Although it is almost impolite to boast, perhaps we can say with patriotic pride that the flying machines we see here from the Wright Brothers 12-horsepower biplane to the latest space vehicle were mostly "Made in U.S.A."

The story of powered flight is an American saga. The wonder is that it has all happened within the lifetime and the memory of living Americans. How many of us remember vividly the thrill of the first take-off? How many recall the first news of Lindbergh's safe landing in Paris? How many saw man's first giant step that planted the American flag on the moon?

At this moment, an unmanned Viking spacecraft is circling the planet Mars. It has only been 80 years since the Smithsonian's Samuel Langley launched his unmanned aerodrome for a half-mile flight before it plunged into the Potomac.

The amazing American achievements in air and space tell us something even more important about ourselves on earth. The hallmark of the American adventure has been a willingness—even an eagerness—to reach for the unknown.

For three and a half centuries Americans and their ancestors have been explorers and inventors, pilgrims and pioneers, always searching for something new across the oceans, across the continent, across the solar system, across the frontiers of science, beyond the boundaries of the human mind.

Confined within these walls and windows are the products of American men and women whose imagination could not be confined. There is nothing more American than saying if at first you don't succeed, try, try again.

Nor could Americans be confined to the Atlantic Seaboard. The wide open spaces have lured Americans from our beginnings. The frontier shaped and molded our society and people.

Gertrude Stein once wrote, "In the United States there is more space where nobody is than where anybody is." This is what makes America what it is.

Indeed, the impact of what is unknown, of what was dimly perceived to be as "out there" has left a permanent mark on the American character.

In the early 17th century, a few fragile vessels—like the *Discovery* in 1607 and the *Mayflower* in 1620—sailed across 3,000 miles of unfriendly sea. Their passengers and crew knew far less about their destination

than the American astronauts knew at lift-off about the lunar landscape a quarter million miles away.

The pilgrims feared the perils of the voyage and the misery of the unfamiliar land, but the sentiments that sustained them were recorded by Governor William Bradford "that all great and honorable actions are accompanied with great difficulties and must be both enterprised and overcome with answerable courages."

Behind them lay the mighty ocean, separating them from the world they knew and before them lay an untamed wilderness. Three and a half centuries later that wilderness has been transformed. A continent once remote and isolated now supports a mighty nation, a nation built by those who also dared to reach for the unknown.

The discovery of this continent was unprecedented. It opened the eyes of mankind, showing them the world was bigger than they had thought. Our nation's birthday was unprecedented as well. A new form of Government was begun which would allow for change by future generations, yet secure basic rights to men and women.

The chance to earn property was given to those who had never had property, education to those who had never been educated.

In the New World, Americans had to be handy. Ours was a do-it-yourself society. Our fascination with machines to lighten labor and increase production began very early. The practical problems of engineering and science required education. The hard life attracted few learned scholars from Europe. Sometimes Americans built their schools before their own rough cabins.

By the time of the Revolution, there were more colleges and universities in America than in the British Isles. The men who wrote our Declaration of Independence were probably the best educated rebels and revolutionaries history had ever seen. When independence was won, the growth of free public education in the United States amazed the world and quickened our pace in science and technology.

Our Constitution specifically gave Congress power to promote science and useful arts by rewarding inventors and authors with patents and copyrights. While some Governments are always fearful of what individuals may write or discover, ours has always encouraged free inquiry, with results that speak for themselves.

It was just a century ago, at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition in 1876, that Alexander Graham Bell first publicly demonstrated his telephone. Today, millions around the world can see and hear the highlights of history as they are happening. Each new discovery, the result of each experiment, humbles us by the dimensions of the unknown. Our progress can be measured not only by the extent of our knowledge, but by increasing awareness of all that remains to be discovered.

To keep reaching into the unknown, we must remain free. We must have freedom to find and freedom to fail. Like our ancestors, we are always at the edge of the unknown.

In the next 100 years, the American spirit of adventure can find out even more about the forces of nature, how to harness them, preserve them; explore the great riches of the oceans, still an uncharted frontier; turn space into a partner for controlling pollution and instant communication to every corner of the world; learn how to make our energy resources renewable and draw new energy from sun and earth; develop new agricultural technologies so all the deserts of the earth can bloom; conquer many more of humanity's deadly enemies, such as cancer and heart disease.

As Thoreau reminded us, long before the

age of air and space, "The frontiers are not east or west, north or south, but wherever man fronts a fact." The American adventure is driven forward by challenge, competition and creativity.

It demands of us sweat and sacrifice and gives us substance and satisfaction. Our country must never cease to be a place where men and women try the untried, test the impossible and take uncertain paths into the unknown.

Our Bicentennial commemorates the beginning of such a quest, a daring attempt to build a new order in which free people govern themselves and fulfill their individual destinies. But, the best of the American adventure lies ahead.

Thomas Jefferson said: "I like to dream of the future better than the history of the past." So did his friendly rival, John Adams, who wrote of his dream: "to see rising in America an empire of liberty, and a prospect of two or three hundred millions of free men, without one noble or one king among them. You say it is impossible. If I should agree with you in this, I would still say—let us try the experiment."

I can only add—let the experiment continue.

#### CLEVELAND BLACK HISTORICAL FIGURES COME TO LIFE UNDER JOURNALIST'S PEN

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the occasion to read an article by Mr. Robert G. McGruder, an outstanding Cleveland journalist. Mr. McGruder, a reporter with the Cleveland Plain Dealer newspaper, has written a scholarly article of rare sensitivity on famous black historical figures of Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, Bob McGruder has performed a significant educational service to the citizens of Cleveland. For too long, black history and black accomplishments have gone unnoticed in the media. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that our citizens are constantly bombarded with the more negative aspects of urban life. For this reason, I commend Mr. McGruder and the Cleveland Plain Dealer for their special Bicentennial recognition of black accomplishments. It will give our black citizens a heightened sense of pride in their illustrious forebearers and will serve to inform all Clevelanders of the diversity and wealth of the black experience.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you the following article, "When Cleveland Was Called Hope," which appeared in the Sunday, July 4th edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer newspaper:

#### WHEN CLEVELAND WAS CALLED HOPE

(By Robert G. McGruder)

Julia A. J. Foote was first a slave and, later in her life, an evangelist. Perhaps it was the combination of the two experiences that moved her to say, "I shall praise God through all eternity for sending me to Cleveland."

Her feelings, expressed almost 100 years ago, were probably those of most of Cleveland's early black residents. Freeman and fugitive slaves from the South saw Cleveland as the city of hope. Hope was Cleveland's code name along the Underground Railroad.

Not every generation has felt as enthusiastic about Cleveland as Julia Foote. The city went from being a center of abolitionist sentiment and key stopping point on the Underground Railroad in the 19th century to a place of cruel racism and discrimination in the 20th century.

John Malvin came to Cleveland in 1831. That was 35 years after Joseph Hodge, a black hunter and trapper who was also called Black Joe, led Moses Cleaveland's party to what is now Conneaut Creek, and 22 years after George Peake became the first black resident of the city.

Malvin was an uncommon man—preacher, engineer, canal boat captain, educator and free black. The South wanted no part of free blacks, guessing that they might cause envy and unrest among the slaves, and although the North had rejected slavery, it had made it clear that the freemen were not welcome.

Freemen like Malvin were undeterred by laws designed to keep blacks out of the North. While the Ohio Constitutional Convention of 1802 had banned slavery—by one vote—it had dictated that blacks could not vote, hold office or testify against a white man in court.

In later years, to further discourage blacks from entering the state, laws were passed requiring a black man to have a certificate proving he was a freeman and not a runaway slave. Upon entering the county, a black had to register with the county clerk. Later regulations required all blacks entering Ohio to post a \$500 bond.

Blacks were barred from the militia and excluded from juries. They were also denied the company of whites in state poorhouses and insane asylums.

Malvin fought continually to get these laws wiped off the books. When he arrived in Cincinnati from his native Virginia in 1827, he immediately organized resistance to the \$500 bond law. He also became active in the Underground Railroad.

He was moving to the freer climate of Canada when he stopped in Cleveland, then a village of 1,200 persons, and decided to settle. Though the same antiblack laws were in effect, enforcement was not as rigid and Cleveland, with its smaller black population, offered fewer problems than Cincinnati.

One of his first moves in Cleveland was to call a meeting of the few blacks in the city and organized a school for blacks. It was the only black institution he ever fostered, believing that the real struggle was in insuring the admission of blacks to white institutions.

Malvin succeeded in preventing black members of the First Baptist Church from being segregated into a "colored gallery" when the church was constructed in 1835.

At 66 he organized a company of black soldiers to fight in the Civil War. However, the governor of Ohio did not feel he had the authority to accept the help of black troops.

Malvin, like many black leaders of his time, was a tireless worker in aiding blacks moving along the Underground Railroad to Canada.

For most of his life in Cleveland, Malvin lived in a city where there was more freedom and racial equality than other blacks were experiencing in the North. Prejudice and discrimination existed, but Cleveland was far less hostile than other cities.

Whites and blacks worked to move fugitive slaves to Canada and protect them from slave hunters. It was an abolitionist city, except for those who thought that the best thing for blacks was to send them back to Africa.

Malvin died in 1880. By then the feeling was beginning to shift and barriers were rising against blacks.

Cleveland had a population of 93,000 in 1870. By 1915 it was an industrial center of 560,663 and the sixth largest city in the

country. In the same period the black population grew from 1,293 to 8,448.

While for many years blacks had lived in every section of the city, as the black population grew, it began to be restricted to certain neighborhoods.

Middle-class blacks still thought Cleveland was free of much of the discrimination experienced in other cities, but lower-class blacks knew better. Restaurants, parks, playgrounds, swimming pools and hotels were being closed off to blacks.

Two major black figures of this time were Charles Wadell Chesnutt, the nation's first black novelist and short story writer, and George A. Myers, a black barber who was close to some of the most powerful political figures of his day. Both were part of an older elite that was recognized as the black leadership of the time.

Chesnutt was born in Cleveland in 1858. He was educated in North Carolina and at 22 was principal of Fayetteville State Normal School. After a brief stay in New York, working as a reporter, he returned to Cleveland.

By 1901 he had established a good reputation as a writer with the publication of three novels and two collections of short stories. Many of his stories appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*.

Although he had a law degree, he worked as a stenographer and court reporter. His family was part of a black elite that moved comfortably in white society.

Chesnutt was an early member of the Chamber of Commerce and the first black member of the Rowfant Club, an exclusive literary group. He lived in an integrated neighborhood and his children went to the best schools.

In the world he lived in, he was untouched by the growing problems of discrimination against blacks. He was able to write, "In this liberal and progressive Northern city we get most of the things which make life worth living, and this in spite of the fact that everyone knows our origin . . ."

Chesnutt believed that complete acceptance of blacks would come in time.

Before World War I he was a determined integrationist and a critic of Booker T. Washington.

But as discrimination against blacks increased, Chesnutt began to be disillusioned about the gradual acceptance of blacks. He saw the Cleveland ghetto expanding and conditions for blacks getting worse. At one point he lamented that there was no place in the city where he, a light-skinned black, could take a dark-skinned man for lunch.

Chesnutt died in 1932.

George A. Myers also witnessed the change in Cleveland. He wrote in 1928, "Time was that Cleveland was the freest from prejudice and the fairest city in the United States not excepting Freedom's birthplace, Boston. Today we have only two unrestricted privileges left, the Ballot and the Public Schools."

Myers had enjoyed many privileges during his life in Cleveland. While most factory workers were making around \$500 to \$700 a year in the late 1890s, Myers' lucrative barbershop made him one of the few blacks with an income of more than \$3,000 a year.

Myers was born in Baltimore. He rejected medicine as a career and became a barber. He came to Cleveland in 1879 at 20. With the help of influential whites, he got the barbershop in the luxurious new Hollenden Hotel in 1888. (It was razed in 1962 and replaced by Hollenden House.)

The barbershop, with its telephones beside each of the modern barber chairs that Myers helped design, was said to be the best in the country. By 1920 Myers employed 17 barbers and a collection of manicurists, porters, hairdressers, cashiers and two podiatrists.

Myers' barbershop was the meeting place for all the politicians and important men of the day. He got to know James Ford Rhodes, Newton D. Baker and Marcus H. Hanna.

Association with Hanna and his prominent position among blacks led him into politics.

On several occasions he cast or secured key votes at conventions that aided Hanna. Myers was a constant worker for the Hanna machine among blacks.

Men like Myers, Chesnutt and the more militant Harry C. Smith believed passionately in integration. Smith, editor of the *Cleveland Gazette* and a three-term state legislator, was active in Republican politics until he became disillusioned at the party's failure to extend patronage to black voters who were being taken for granted.

These men and the politicians of the day began to lose their influence in the period after World War I.

After the great migration of blacks and the hardening of racial attitudes, the integrationists gave way to a group of leaders who favored separate institutions for blacks and whites.

Typical of the philosophical fight between the old and new leadership was the debate that surrounded the creation of the Phillis Wheatley Association by Jane E. Hunter.

Miss Hunter came to Cleveland in 1905. A trained nurse, she immediately confronted the racial prejudice against black nurses. Even the tax-supported City Hospital did not open its doors for black interns and student nurses until ordered to do so in 1931.

The Phillis Wheatley Association was a residence home and job training center for girls. Miss Hunter established it in 1912 and it served as the only major institution created for blacks during that time.

Integrationists attacked it bitterly as a step backward toward segregation. But it was a major asset as more and more young women poured into the city needing help, protection, training, jobs and places for wholesome recreation.

The home was named after a 7-year-old from Senegal who was sold on the Boston slave block in 1761.

Blacks had moved up through the ranks of the Republican party and served in the state legislature as early as 1882 when John P. Green was elected to the House of Representatives.

Thomas W. Fleming was the first black elected to Cleveland City Council.

Fleming wielded enormous power as political leader of the city's growing black population in the early 1900s. He was elected to City Council in 1909 and was Republican boss of Ward 11 for two decades.

In 1929 Fleming was convicted of soliciting a bribe from Walter L. Oehme.

After Fleming served a 33-month sentence in the Ohio Penitentiary, Gov. George White restored his citizenship rights and Fleming resumed his law practice here. Fleming's power eroded while he was in prison. He and other conservative black leaders also were giving way to a wave of men who seemed more responsive to the needs of blacks who were part of the great migration. These were men like Harry E. Davis, Chester K. Gillespie, Clayborne George, Charles W. White and others.

The mood of the black voter was also shifting away from the Republican party that had held blacks in bondage for generations. Running first as independents and then as Democrats, blacks began to win council seats.

In 1967 the election of Carl B. Stokes as the first black mayor of a major U.S. city seemed to indicate a return to the old days of racial harmony, cooperation and hope.



**THELMA GRAY—ORIGINATOR OF  
BICENTENNIAL WAGON TRAIN**

**HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, what symbolizes America's history and ideas and dreams? In this Bicentennial Year the planners of Pennsylvania's celebration posed this question to many people. One of them, Thelma Gray of West Chester, Pa., decided that it was the frontier spirit which epitomized our heritage.

As the Pennsylvania observance of our 200th birthday, Mrs. Gray's idea of the frontier spirit grew into a 50-State wagon train which trekked from the west coast starting in 1975, arriving at Valley Forge, on July 3, 1976. Also converging on the park were independent trains from throughout the country, horses and riders attracted by the thrill of the train, and hundreds of delighted followers. The Bicentennial Wagon Train dramatically symbolized the pioneer spirit and captured the imagination of millions as the wagons slowly wound their way to the site of George Washington's winter encampment.

For her ideas, for her persistence in organizing, and for her spirit which moved this wagon train idea, Mrs. Gray, a constituent of the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, deserves our public thanks and honor.

The following article on Mrs. Gray appeared in the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa.:

**GRAY DESIGNED WAGON TRAIN TO REVIVE  
PIONEERING**

You don't have to go west and climb a Rocky to assimilate the frontier flavor, or go south to Cumberland Gap for a view of pioneer isolation. You don't even have to journey to western Pennsylvania for an aerial glance from mountain into valley. You can do all those things in West Chester.

Just stand on Jerome and Thelma Gray's front stoop at Dover House and slant your eyes on the horizon beyond the valley below where automobiles speed like dimestore miniatures along the parallels of a concrete super highway, and you can't help looking west, out toward the rest of America.

The Gray's welcome mat says, "Go Away," but Dover House's reputation for hospitality belies the command, and whatever the Gray's grandchildren had in mind when they put the mat there some years ago, it certainly had nothing to do with wagon trains.

**WESTWARD WAGONS**

Yet those two words perfectly detail what many of our ancestors did when they elected to cast their futures into the endless sweep of westward wagons early in the 19th century.

Thousands and thousands of them left the cities and towns that fringed the east coast with increasing urban niceties after the American Revolution. They were joined by thousands more from the warrens of Europe who exchanged with scarcely a pause the pitch and roll of the wracking ocean voyage for the bump and thump of the Conestoga wagons and great Prairie Schooners. They wanted to go away from their old lives which were without prospects; they wanted to go away to a land of promise.

Since Philadelphia was a major port of entry, and since route of the Conestoga wag-

ons went to Lancaster, many of these early pioneers passed through Chester County. Some stayed long enough to leave families behind; some tarried just a few years until they could get the wherewithal to depart; some went directly into the wilderness beyond. But in 1832 the first railroad tracks were laid in Chester County and the western wagons were soon going away no more.

Now the wagons are coming back for the Bicentennial. This time they are moving in an easterly direction and there will be 50 of them, one for each state in the union, converging on Valley Forge for an enormous celebration July Fourth. The whole colossal, wild, impossible (and to some critics meretricious) design to recreate a reverse wagon train migration traveling six historic routes, involving thousands of tenderfoot people as well as horses, began right here in Chester County with West Chester's Thelma Gray who lives where the doormat says "Go Away."

"Thelma is the best idea man in the business," a former colleague of hers in the stratosphere of advertising says with that curious disregard for gender that is felt to be the ultimate tribute to a professional woman in 1976.

**SILVER MEDAL**

Being the best is what got Mrs. Gray where she is today: President of T. Gray Associates, a division of Aitkin-Kynette Co., winner of the Philadelphia Club of Advertising Women's first Silver Medal Award, newly elected chairperson and president of the Advertising Review Council of the Delaware Valley, and creator of the Bicentennial Wagon Train.

Technically the wagon train is a project of the Bicentennial Commission of Pennsylvania. It is also a child of public relations and the only viable celebration that involves the whole country's participation. While Op-Sail involves people from all over the world, you have to go to New York to be part of it. The much publicized Bicentennial Freedom Train is said to be puffing about the rails somewhere in the midwest, but not much has been heard of it lately. By contrast, the wagon train seems to be everywhere and have a little something for everyone wherever it is.

Is that the way Thelma Gray planned it? Well, yes, frankly it is. That's what separates the big ideas that work from the little ones that don't in the competitive world of public relations.

"When the Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission said, 'Could you develop a program for us for the Bicentennial?' I looked at it the way I would any other problem a corporation might bring to me," she says.

**TORN APART**

"You have to find out what the basic question is. Often you find that it is different from the problem that is articulated. So I asked myself, 'What do we really mean by the Bicentennial? What do we hope to accomplish? Is it just a celebration for the sake of celebration?' Now this was back in 1972, the country was torn apart politically and emotionally. I knew it was not the first time in our 200 years history that we had been torn apart.

"So I asked myself, 'What is it that enables us to recover? What is the seed of dynamism in this country that enables America to bounce back. Historically other countries have endured similar situations, but they do not shoot forward afterwards; there is a lack of vitality.' Mrs. Gray has explained her inspiration for the wagon train to so many people and so many groups who needed to be sold on the idea, she can marshal her thoughts about the project like a wagon master reining his team around.

"I decided that America had a unique quality that has enabled it to survive no matter what stress we've been under or what our internal conditions were. Every generation in the U.S. has produced its own heroes

unique to that generation. The more I examined them, the more I realized that it was the pioneer spirit that showed through, the pioneer quality in all of them. It gave the early settlers the opportunity to open a wilderness for homesteading, enabled us to explore space, to get to the moon, to engage in some of the greatest medical research in the world. The drive to explore, to meet challenges is the dynamics of this country."

**BACK ON WHEELS**

Having distilled the Bicentennial into the pioneer spirit, most organizers would be content to stop. They would open a museum and fill it with trail blazing artifacts—old wagon bells, drawings of Ward Bond and John Wayne types, maybe a fragment of moon rock. But remember, in a field that swarms with superlatives, Thelma Gray is "the best." Perhaps she is to advertising what the greatest is to boxing. Anyway, she put the pioneer spirit back on wheels.

"I wanted to dramatize the pioneer quality so it could have meaning for everybody. I don't like bombastic celebrations that have big moments for preaching: I think they go right over the heads of the public. I not only wanted to dramatize the concept. I wanted to bring some emotionalism into it," she says.

"Now from the beginning, the Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission had insisted that any celebration they approved had to have historic meaning, had to be relevant, human and fun. Those were very astute guidelines. I decided if we could recreate the period when America moved west, when we faced all kinds of challenges, we would have a perfect springboard.

Mrs. Gray says way back in 1972 she wasn't bitten by the bicentennial bug because so many programs envisioned at the time seemed uninspirational, because the problems we faced seemed to lead us away from democracy, because the social system itself seemed in doubt. "I had absorbed a good deal of this feeling. But I have had a very strange rebirth as an individual. I have found that the people of this country have not lost one iota of the pioneer quality. We have more vitality as a people than I ever believed possible. I feel almost like a preacher from a pulpit on the subject," she says.

**REDEDICATION**

Mrs. Gray's certitude is reenforced by the popularity of the rededication scrolls that the Bicentennial Wagon Train is circulating and collecting all over the country. Millions of people are signing their names to this restatement of the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

"People feel symbolically that they are making the trip to Valley Forge by signing their names," says Mrs. Gray. "In many ways the pledge has become the most important thing about the wagon train. It is a way for everybody to become involved.

Involvement has been the key to the wagon train all along the line, she feels. "People know what's coming because we move so slowly. Mostly they can walk with us, even if just for a mile. By stopping at each local community every 20 miles, by putting on our wagon train show and having local entertainment follow, Americans from three on up can participate."

There has been some criticism of the vast design, but Mrs. Gray feels that grass roots acceptance of the wagon train has overwhelmed the carpers. "I don't worry that the wagon train will be blemished," she says. Before the first year's run was out the procession had survived an Indian attack, the tragic death of a wagon master and a dearth of food and water in the desert. This year a spooked team nearly wrecked the Oklahoma wagon, the San Diego Humane Society impounded two mules, and two North Carolina

Horsemen on that state's bicentennial commission delivered a verbal lashing to the wagon train.

"This too will level out and pass," says Mrs. Gray, who, having put the idea in motion, has full confidence in the people whose job it is to make it work. "The wagon train has the pioneer spirit," she says confidently.

#### ROLE OF WOMEN

The Bicentennial year is one in which the role of women in American society has been given most concerned scrutiny, and future social historians may draw significant conclusions from the fact that a woman was responsible for the major national event of 1976. They probably should not.

"Women in business are more equal today," says Thelma Gray. "We've passed legislation that is forceful, but that doesn't change personal attitudes of management and people's responses. Still, we comply with the letter of the law, we're moving. A young woman coming into business today has a good future 10 years from now."

While training for women in management is better and getting better, the other criteria for success won't change, Mrs. Gray thinks. "I've worked awfully hard," she says. "I had good home training, I was a broad reader as a child; anything I've decided to do I've literally attacked with a vengeance."

Mrs. Gray has been in the advertising field since 1945. She specialized in psychology, economics and sociology at Temple University and went on to the University of Pennsylvania for a master's degree. Her thesis there was on "The Psychology of Laughter." Maybe this background helped her row a steady oar on the peripatetic river of public relations.

She and her husband have shared their professional as well as their domestic hours for three decades. "I think it makes a much better marriage," she says. "I sincerely believe that a husband who is mentally stimulating enjoys a wife that is equally stimulating. Today with all the convenience equipment there is in the home I think a woman, if she wants to, by time and energy is able to work without conflict."

On weekends when she is not designing images, Thelma Gray enjoys gourmet cooking and gardening. "I love plants that bloom and have color and fragrance. Things that are just green don't give me an emotional kick. My greatest pleasure is taking a cutting and seeing it actually root."

Ideas root too. Thelma Gray has been watching her wagon train grow for two years. It's scheduled to flower in red, white and blue on July Fourth.

#### A BICENTENNIAL TRIBUTE

### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue our national Bicentennial celebrations, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following "Tribute to the Bicentennial" written by Mrs. Ida M. Darden of Houston, Tex. Mrs. Darden was for many years the owner, editor and publisher of a Fort Worth newspaper, the Southern Conservative. She is presently a resident of Holly Hall in Houston, Tex. and has written this article as her personal gift to our Nation and the Bicentennial celebration. It is only fitting that her comments should be available to the Congress and the Nation at this time:

#### A BICENTENNIAL TRIBUTE

(By Ida M. Darden)

Nineteen hundred and seventy six is being hailed around the world as Bicentennial Year, celebrating the birth of the American Republic two centuries ago.

This illustrious country, which is being honored, came into being because of man's inborn desire for an environment of liberty, equality, justice and human dignity.

It was born of that spirit which impelled oppressed people in the thirteenth century to express rebellion by handing the Magna Charta to King John on the point of a sword.

It was conceived in the hearts and minds of Christians, who preferred to worship God under a tree in a land where freedom abounded, rather than in gilded Cathedrals of Europe, where tyranny reigned.

It gave birth to the exalted concept that all men are born equal, thereby sounding the death knell to the ancient belief of the divine rights of kings.

It afforded a haven for the homeless and encouraged the oppressed to break the ties that held them in bondage, and to seek sanctuary on our friendly shores.

The Fourth of July is just a date in history, but it is a date which is indelibly etched in human memory. Its immortality stems from its association with a memorable Declaration which says in part:

"We hold these truths to be self evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In 1776, this proclamation reverberated throughout the world as a new star was born in the vast constellation of nations. It was named the United States of America.

All of us love our country and our loyalty to its traditions cannot be challenged. Possibly we do not all appreciate the assets and resources with which we are so generously endowed.

Perhaps there is no better time than during the balance of the Centennial Year to make a mental survey of the spiritual and material blessings which make our country supreme among the nations of the earth.

America was founded as a Christian Nation. No official document was used in the framing of our system of government which did not recognize God as the Supreme Ruler of the land. No oath of office is ever administered unless the name of God is invoked as witness to the vow.

As the coming months slowly fade into history, and the festivities gradually wind towards an end, all Americans should express eternal gratitude to the dedicated men and women who made this bicentennial year such a glorious success.

Certainly our national image has been strengthened and our international stature lengthened because the bicentennial has focused world attention on this fabulous land of the free and home of the brave.

#### HOW TO FEED HUNGRY, INCENTIVE NEEDED

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, many of us do not adequately recognize the importance of private enterprise and incentive in the production of food in this country. I would like to share with you excerpts from a speech by John H.

Brinker, Jr., president of A. O. Smith Harvester Products, Inc. before the Livestock Marketing Convention. Mr. Brinker outlines the use of the ultimate instrument, food, as the method by which mankind can survive. He also calls upon the United States to exercise its leadership role to assure an adequacy of food through the profit incentive system. As Mr. Brinker points out, too often the mob goes in search of bread and the means it employs is, generally, to wreck the bakeries. Instant experts on food policy would destroy the incentive that has encouraged the American farmer to produce not only for our needs at home, but for those in needy nations as well.

The article follows:

[From the Livestock Market Digest, June 21, 1976]

#### BRINKER TELLS HOW TO FEED HUNGRY

I'm very pleased and flattered to be included in your program, and I welcome the opportunity to visit with you about things that are going on in the world which will not only shape both world and American agriculture, but will also, inescapably, affect the lives and professional careers of every American who has selected agriculture, both as a profession and a way of life.

As my title for these remarks, I have chosen "The Ultimate Weapon." This title is rather dramatic—and deliberately so—because I wanted to get your attention—and because it's true! The problems I'll be discussing are very serious and will affect the lives of everyone now living on this spaceship we call Earth.

These are world problems, but the four recommendations I'll make are for American solutions, if the American people have the wit and will to make it so.

We Americans will not be victims of these problems unless we ask for that fate, by our own failure to understand the problems and the potential solutions. Understanding the problems will be relatively easy for most of the American people, but the price we will have to pay to bring into being an American solution may not be easy for our people to accept. However, we are the only people in the world who will be capable of creating conditions which will make solutions of these recommendations.

Two things—a lucky accident of geography and our economic system—will make it possible for us to escape being victims of these problems.

Before going any further, let me acknowledge that the problems and solutions I'm going to discuss with you today are going to be, of necessity, simplistically stated. Each time I think about my recommendations, I recognize more problems in connection with their execution, but that doesn't change the necessity for clearly recognizing the basic problems and the unpleasant character of some of the necessary solutions.

Solving these problems for humanity involves a situation comparable to the old story to the effect that if a man wants to walk a thousand miles, he starts by taking one step. The American people need to take that step, and really understand that we're going to have to walk that thousand miles.

In my opinion, if the world's people are to continue eating at more than a subsistence level, we Americans must be prepared to do four things.

The first of these recommendations should be brought into effect immediately, as a national policy. The other recommendations are expansions and modifications of things we are already doing.

First, we should bring into existence a National Land Use Policy, which would stop our present profligate use of prime farm



land to make parking lots for shopping centers and similar permanent losses of our greatest natural resource. In order to be effective, this would have to be national policy, with administration by each State, to insure its being locally effective.

The world cannot afford to have the states of Rhode Island and Delaware disappear annually from our productive land and climate.

Second, we must protect our way of life, and our economic system, by being willing to pay much more for meat protein than we do today. As the President has stated with respect to the "energy crisis" and oil prices, there is no way to increase production of food and our exportable surpluses unless we Americans are willing to pay more for our food.

The present "consumerism" of Congress is doing a grave disservice to the American people in both our "energy crisis" and our food supply, by failing to recognize that, in a free market system, only higher prices will bring marginal production into being.

For instance, there is no way we can cause a billion acres of non-tillable forage land to come into protein production, in the form of ruminant-animal meat, unless we continue to eat more meat—at much higher prices. Under our system, we can't command farmers to work marginal land. They won't do it unless there's a profit available.

Considering 1974's ridiculous boycotts of supermarkets, and the "meatless Tuesday" programs sponsored by many well-meaning churches, this also means that we must have a massive educational program for our people. It seems to me that the most logical choices to take leadership in this are farmers' organizations and the Department of Agriculture.

Third, we must remain generous. We are presently pumping food aid into the world at four times the combined rate of all the other developed nations.

As the only humans with food surpluses in the years ahead, we must continue to do that, and we must expand it. However, we must also insure that our generosity only goes to nations who are trying to control their own population growth and improve their own agricultural practices.

By sharing only with such nations, we will encourage them to control their population. If they don't, or won't control their populations, sharing our surplus with them will merely postpone their inevitable starvation.

At the 1974 United Nations meetings in Bucharest and Rome, spokesmen for the "developing nations" stated that they had no population problem and then they made two policy statements: 1) The hungry nations have the right to produce as many children as they please; and, 2) Others have the responsibility to feed them.

Within our free economic system, this selective sharing of our food surplus with other nations may require a two-tier agricultural pricing system; one domestic system, in which the American farmer can sell within our country. Then we will need a second system, administered by the national government, whereby the American people buy our surplus food for distribution which carries out our National Policies with respect to sharing our surpluses.

Let's recognize something else; as we export more of the food we grow, we will become more susceptible to world weather conditions and the state of the world economy. It probably will be necessary for our national government to stand between the American farmers and those world conditions, in order to insure our farmers against a catastrophic year because of unusually good weather someplace else in the world, and also to stand between world hunger and a bad year in the United States, by maintaining inventories of grain available for export.

Fourth, we must recognize something unpleasant about the world. When people are

actually starving in nations which have nuclear weapons—and this will be the case in a year or two, if it isn't already, and if America is eating well, with plenty of meat protein, and we will be, the temptation to try to take our land away from us is going to be almost irresistible to one demagogue or another.

A Spanish economist, Jose Ortega, once said, "The mob goes in search of bread, and the means it employs is, generally, to wreck the bakeries."

There's an economic system in the world dedicated to destroying ours! That system, in spite of its own poor agricultural productivity, won't recognize that our economic system has a great deal to do with our productivity. They will destroy it, if they can, under the excuse of distributing the world's available food more equitably.

We are already seeing political and military conflicts arising out of the world's food shortage. That's exactly what's going on in the waters around Iceland between the Royal Navy and Iceland's gun boats. So far, nobody's fired a shot.

So my fourth, and most important recommendation to the American people is stay so strong militarily that no one will dare try to take our land and our food, or if they try, we will repulse them.

Ladies and gentlemen, surplus food is the "Ultimate Weapon," and it's impossible for anyone but the United States to have it by the year 2,000.

Since only America will have surplus food, only America can wield the "Ultimate Weapon," and only America can lead mankind into the self-discipline of controlling human population while, simultaneously, expanding the world's protein and calorie production to match its population.

Our technology will lead an increased world agricultural production and our surplus food will, ultimately, control world population. Under these inevitable circumstances, mankind can survive—only if we lead it!

#### REVISION OF THE BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, on June 22 the administration attempted to ram through the most sweeping revision of the Bretton Woods Agreements in over 30 years. These agreements established the International Monetary Fund and regulate the entire international monetary framework. Many of my colleagues were very confused about this bill and all that it encompassed. Fortunately, enough of them realized the importance of H.R. 13955 to prevent its passage on the suspension calendar.

This bill is once again scheduled for action again this week. So that my colleagues may be better informed about this important piece of legislation, I would like to commend to them an excellent editorial by Mr. Robert Bleiberg from the July 12, 1976, issue of *Barron's*:

SHADES OF BRETTON WOODS, CONGRESS SHOULD NOT RUBBERSTAMP THE TREASURY'S BILL

(By Robert M. Bleiberg)

For ordinary mortals, unaccustomed to chauffeured limousines, palatial suites of offices, tax-free salaries or lavish perks, money troubles among the high-and-

mighty provide a good excuse for glee. Downstairs, so to speak, getting a bit of its own back from upstairs. Thus, along with millions of our fellow citizens, we have viewed with wry amusement the far-from-stately squabbles, so foreign to British tradition, that now and then surface with respect to the Royal Family's allowance. We thoroughly enjoyed the spectacle of Lyndon Johnson creeping around the White House turning out the lights. We have chortled over the UN's perennial case of the shorts. On this score, some kind of high—or low—was reached a couple of months ago when an unseemly dispute over salaries, one which pitted the global bureaucracy against the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, erupted at the International Monetary Fund. Carrying placards denouncing the Cabinet officer as the "beast of the hour," half of the IMF staff staged an unprofessional and undignified one-day walkout over wages and working conditions.

Far from beating a hasty retreat, as at least one of his colleagues would doubtless have done, Secretary Simon refused to budge. In an unprecedented move, he sent personal letters, often on a first-name basis, to other members of the Fund, saying how appalled he was that "our most respected financial agencies are proposing a substantial increase in wages at a time when the entire world has suffered from far too much inflation." The IMF staff, he went on, "is one of the highest paid group of workers in the history of international civil servants"—over 90, he tactfully refrained from adding, or nearly one in seven, make more money (net of taxes, from which they are exempt) than he does. "Their demands for an even larger increase are ridiculous when I compare their salaries and fringe benefits with comparable organizations—both domestic and international. When they name me 'Beast,' I hope I get to pick the type of animal, because I guarantee you it will be carnivorous." In the end, the bureaucrats settled for less.

Vis-a-vis the International Monetary Fund, that was Bill Simon's finest hour. In his other dealings lately with the IMF, the Treasury Secretary has shown no sign of either bark or bite, let alone fang and claw; on the contrary, he has acted like a pussycat. Thus, with official U.S. blessing, the global agency last month auctioned off some three quarters of a million ounces of gold, originally turned over to it by members, at \$126 apiece; a second such sale is scheduled to take place day after tomorrow. By the same token, the Ford Administration quietly, and unsuccessfully, has just tried to ram through a bill, the so-called Bretton Woods Agreements Act Amendment, on the eve of Congress' Fourth of July adjournment. Among other things, the pending legislation would put the lawmakers retroactive seal of approval on various measures already embraced by the Treasury at Rambouillet and Jamaica, notably ratification of floating exchange rates under supervision of the IMF, and distribution by the latter, to designated needy countries, of the proceeds of the sales of gold.

Labelling the measure non-controversial, the Administration sought to push it through on the so-called House suspension calendar, "sandwiched," so one Congressman caustically observed, "between a bill on bike parts and another on fat cigars." However, thanks to the vigorous opposition of such solons as Rep. John B. Conlan (R., Ariz.) and Ronald Paul (R., Tex.), the maneuver failed to gain the needed majority of two-thirds. Further debate is slated; well it might be.

For Congress has been asked to endorse several very dubious propositions. Under one, the IMF, which is supposed to extend credit on a carefully rationed basis to countries suffering temporary upsets in the balance of payments, would be authorized to dole out billions of dollars virtually interest-free to,

among other eligibles, Cambodia, Uganda and Vietnam. Again, the sale of gold—past, present and future—would gain official sanction, although the Library of Congress, in a special memo to Rep. Conlan, concludes that such transactions rest on doubtful legal grounds. Finally, after more than three decades during which hundreds of devaluations, including two of the American dollar, have occurred, it's surely time to reappraise, not rubber-stamp, the poor results of Bretton Woods. "By their fruits"—this crop has been a disaster—"ye shall know them."

"With sufficient time, money and staff," Congressman Paul, lone dissenting voice on the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing, has stated for the Record, "It would be possible to produce a massive indictment of the IMF's policies, complete with footnotes, graphs, equations, computer print-outs and references to scholarly journals." Suffice it to say—as Dr. Henry Hazlitt, noted economist and author, repeatedly has said in *Barron's*—that Bretton Woods, brainchild of John Maynard Keynes and Harry Dexter White, from the outset was fatally flawed. Under its loose strictures, the U.S. dollar alone—solely for the benefit of foreign central banks—was tied to gold. "It was not hard," Dr. Hazlitt wryly observed, "to sell this scheme to spokesmen for the other 43 countries. . . . They were thereby relieved of any obligation to convert their currency into gold, and could expand money and credit more freely. If they got into trouble, they had access to automatic borrowing rights from the new International Monetary Fund. The whole arrangement made it much safer to inflate."

Inflate they did. Between 1945 and 1971, when the U.S., thanks to its own freewheeling fiscal and monetary policies, ultimately was forced to renege on its solemn pledge to exchange one ounce of gold for 35 dollars, the world's currencies were debased an estimated 500 times. Whatever it was designed to achieve, the International Monetary Fund in fact had become an engine of global inflation, which, out of its own excesses, finally broke down. To all intents and purposes, as Rep. Paul has argued, "the IMF is dead."

Yet it remains a very lively corpse. At Jamaica last January, the Interim Committee endorsed—subject to ratification, such as embodied in the pending Bretton Woods Amendment—a proposal to increase member's quotas by an average of 32.5%, to 39 billion Special Drawing Rights (one SDR roughly equals \$1.15). Moreover, the powers—that be at IMF decided to extend, by 45%, on a "temporary basis," the quantity of credit (tranche) available to borrowers. Not surprisingly, in the first five months of 1976, the Fund made nearly \$5.3 billion in loans to "nations with special financing problems," a lending rate of roughly twice that of the previous year.

In view of the notorious instability with which currencies in the postwar era—both prior to 1971, and notably since—have been afflicted, that's probably money down the drain. However, as we have seen before, in the realm of bureaucracy, nothing succeeds like failure. Having presided over decades of debasement, the IMF, with U.S. Treasury approval, is seeking, via a yet-to-be-created council within its recesses, authorization to oversee and manage what Rep. Henry Gonzalez (D. Tex.) has aptly called "this shadowy business of setting and maintaining currency values in relation to one another." Contrary to what its proponents argued, floating, owing to repeated intervention in the foreign exchange markets by one government or another, has been recognizably dirty. Now the dirt, so to speak, presumably will be swept under some official rug.

No less objectionable is the scheme to auction off, on behalf of so-called needy nations, up to one sixth of the IMF's total

holdings of gold. Proceeds go into a multi-billion-dollar trust fund, on which any country claiming per capita income of less than \$350 is eligible to draw. Unlike previous practice, where credits were made conditional on some semblance of sensible financial management, trust fund loans (which stipulate a half-decade grace period, followed by a five-year repayment of principal with interest at one half of one percent) will be exceedingly "soft." Countries eligible for such giveaways, as Rep. John H. Rousselot (R., Calif.) points out, include "the notorious General Amin's Uganda, the Communist government of Vietnam and a number of other unworthy recipients."

Official largesse, of course, will be financed by repeated auctions of bullion at the free market price. Yet as critics aver, such sales unmistakably violate a fundamental precept of the organization, namely, that all members should enjoy equal treatment. As to the technicality on which the IMF purports to base its transactions, the Library of Congress has dismissed it in the following scathing terms: "There is no authority, either directly or indirectly, outside of a scarce currency situation (not invoked), for the IMF to sell gold on and for its own account under that clause." Routine and noncontroversial? Like rape.

#### CLEVELAND POET WRITES ON BICENTENNIAL

#### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, now that the fireworks have waned and the glitter and glory of the Nation's birthday party has subsided to a more manageable affair, we should again direct our attention to a more sober and critical evaluation of this country's future.

Mr. James C. Kilgore, renowned Cleveland poet and professor of English at Cuyahoga Community College, has written a thought-provoking poem lamenting the dire condition of blacks in America as we enter our third century.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to carefully read Mr. Kilgore's eloquent lines and absorb the full impact of his challenging exhortation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you today the poem entitled "A Black Bicentennial" by James C. Kilgore of Cleveland, Ohio, which recently appeared in the Cleveland Press newspaper:

"NO TIME FOR TEARS" WRITES BLACK POET  
(By James C. Kilgore)

At 6'5", James C. Kilgore may be one of the tallest poets around as well as being a former college basketball player.

An English professor at Cuyahoga Community College's Eastern Campus for 10 years, he has had a number of his poems appear in various publications.

This one was written at the request of the Cleveland Area Arts Council, which commissioned 10 writers here to write Bicentennial poems. It was chosen among the three best.

"A Black Bicentennial," the concluding portion of which appears below, has been published as a pamphlet by the Black River Writers of East St. Louis, Mo.

I celebrate your dream, America,  
But I cannot celebrate Boston today;  
I cannot sing love songs to Louisville this evening.

I detest the actions of any who would keep little children from coming unto educational justice, unto friendship, unto you.

Yet I can weep no more.

My eyes are tired and dried of tears:

I have cried from Jackson, Mississippi, to Dallas, Texas;

I have mourned from Memphis, Tennessee, to Los Angeles, California;

My life has been a river of tears—

And I have no more tears for any city

That would forbid little children to come unto legal liberty—

Even if they must be bussed to get there.

You don't understand my celebration?

I am not sure I do either—

But I understand the difference between spring and winter, for I love autumn;

I understand the difference between war and peace, for I love freedom;

I understand the difference between night and day, for I have gone without sleep for years trying to understand the midnights and noons of you.

I know that others love you and want you too,

Some would seduce you with brave promises  
And then nullify the decrees of your courts,  
And then flout the one national truth that makes you uniquely you:

You are a nation of laws, a nation of courts.  
Permit anyone who says he loves you to nullify and flout your truth.

And you are not you;

You are a nightmare, no more a dream.

The days rise painfully,

Aching toward a new century;

New York City, the doctor says, is in critical condition;

Yet I know you can save her:

Your own children lie down hungry in Newark and Paterson, New Jersey; in Harlem, New York City; in Inner-City, U.S.A.;

Yet I know you can feed them;

You rebuilt Europe with your Marshall Plan;  
Your ships still sail with wheat for Russia;  
You have tested the soil of the lifeless moon;

You sent tanks full of dollars to South Vietnam;

I know you can save New York City,

That you can feed the children of your inner-cities,

That you can light our way into the rising century with the bright beams of self-love.

There is no more time for tears:

There is only time to gather all your children and teach them of justice, of equal human dignity, of you;

Your future is in their trembling hands;

Perhaps they can forget the unfaithfulness of yesterday and last night;

Perhaps they can become the Dream written in your Declaration, in your Constitution—

And perhaps I, too, can forgive the unfaithfulness of that first one hundred years and the unfaithfulness of the century since I left the big plantation.

#### BICENTENNIAL DEMONSTRATION WRAPUP: RICH OFF OUR BACKS AND PEOPLE'S BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

#### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Castroite Communists and their allies of



the July 4 Coalition held one counter-Bicentennial march in Philadelphia on July 4. A second march and rally attacking our constitutional form of government was staged by the Red Chinese-supported Rich Off Our Backs-July 4 Coalition—ROOB.

ROOB was planned and organized by the Peking-directed Revolutionary Communist Party—RCP—from several RCP fronts including the Vietnam Veterans Against the War—VVAW—the Unemployed Workers Organizing Committee—UWOC—and the RCP's youth arm, the Revolutionary Student Brigade—RSB.

The RCP/ROOB march was the result of 3 months of intensive organizing during which some 1½ million pieces of literature were distributed.

Some 3,000 demonstrators—ROOB claims 3,700—many of them wearing red, yellow, orange, or blue, "Rich Off Our Backs" T-shirts, massed at Broad and Girard Streets at 10 a.m.

The RCP/ROOB assembly point was nearly 3 miles east of the July 4 Coalition march, and its 2-mile court-imposed march route to Norris Square through a residential and light industrial area took them even further from the center city area where the Maoists had hoped to confront those patriotically celebrating our country's 200th anniversary, as well as away from the J4C line of march.

The RCP's disciplined demonstrators united around a few simple shouted slogans, principally "We have carried the rich for 200 years let us get them off our backs." Other chants heard along the march line were "We will not fight another rich man's war" in Spanish and English, "The workers united will never be defeated."

Contingents were present in the RCP/ROOB march from Atlanta, Ga., Baltimore, Md., Birmingham, Ala., Boston, Mass., Chicago, Ill., Cincinnati, Ohio, Cleveland, Ohio, Gainesville, Fla., Milwaukee, Wis., Newark, N.J., New York City, Portland, Oreg., Seattle, Wash., Syracuse, N.Y., Houston, Tex., Trenton, N.J., and from California, Rhode Island, and West Virginia.

The Maoist Communists of the Revolutionary Communist Party, formerly called the Revolutionary Union, have rejected the pro-Soviet Communist Party, U.S.A.'s favorite united front tactic in favor of the sort of cadre organizing in the trade unions in the basic industries and services done by the Communists in the 1920's and 1930's. Present in the RCP/ROOB march were banner-carrying groups representing RCP rank and file caucuses in the steelworkers, auto workers, mineworkers, postal workers, oil, chemical, and communications unions.

The Maoist protest was the culmination of 3 days of protest in Washington as well as in Philadelphia. Some 300 RCP/ROOB activists had demonstrated in Washington on July 1 at the Department of Labor and later on the East Steps of the Capitol. Traveling by automobile, bus and in three trains, ROOB cadre and supporters demonstrated in Philadelphia on July 2 and 3 at the General Hospital which is facing cuts in budget and at the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

The Revolutionary Communist Party contrived, at the building demonstrations and at the July 4 march, to look far larger in numbers than actually were present by using many and multiple banners, by providing red flags for nearly all, and with the unified chanting.

At the square, ROOB staged a 3-hour speech marathon. Speakers included:

Nick Unger, master of ceremonies and ROOB representative. Nichols Unger, was born on February 1, 1945 into a family of Communist Party, U.S.A.—CPUSA—functionaries. His own public entry into radical militant politics began as a sponsor of the April 1965, Students for a Democratic Society march in Washington, D.C., in support of the Vietnamese Communists. After the June 1969, disintegration of SDS, Unger was associated with the RYM-II faction, as were many other young Maoist Communist "red diaper babies" who came from disciplined CPUSA family background.

On May 5, 1970, Nick Unger, then a graduate teaching assistant in physics at NYU, and his comrade, Robert Wolfe, led some 150 NYU students and off-campus hangers-on from SDS and the Transcendental Students Association into Warren Weaver Hall, ejected faculty members, and "captured and liberated" the Courant Institute of Mathematical Science.

Unger and Wolfe then led an occupation of the building. The group had attempted to extort \$100,000 from the university against damage to the \$3.5 million computer center. The ransom was to be given to the Black Panther 21 bail fund. As the occupation ended, an attempt was made to burn the computer which was frustrated by prompt police action. On July 29, 1970, Unger and Wolfe were arrested and indicted for conspiracy, attempted grand larceny by extortion, and attempted coercion.

Nick Unger since that time has taken prominent roles in the Revolutionary Union, now the RCP, and in the principal Maoist Communist outreach organization, the United States-China People's Friendship Association—USCPFA.

Abraham Unger, father of Nicholas, served as a CPUSA attorney in 1949 and was identified as a CPUSA member in 1955. He left in the 1960's supporting the Red Chinese and assisting members of the Progressive Labor Party in his legal capacity during its Maoist period. Mrs. Esther Unger was legal director and State treasurer of the Communist Party of New York State, according to papers filed with the New York State secretary of state.

Johnny Rogers, Unemployed Workers Organizing Committee, Chicago.

Dave Cline, New York-New Jersey United Workers Organization, a recently formed RCP front active in the Newark/New York City area. The front's principal figure is Leibel Bergman, an old CPUSA organizer-gone-Maoist who was a founding RU member. Self-effacing in public, Bergman is one of the most influential RCP Central Committee members.

Eddie Pagan, garment section, New York-New Jersey United Workers Organization.

Barry Romo, national coordinator of

Vietnam Veterans Against the War—VVAW—and one of the principal architects of the 1973-74 penetration and takeover of VVAW by the Maoist cadres of the RU.

Arthur Ward, Milwaukee Youth Contingent.

Bruce Miller, Miners Committee To Defend the Right To Strike, West Virginia. The RCP has attempted to carry out recruitment among some groups within the United Mineworkers Union, but to their immense irritation RCP organizers have had in many cases the union's anti-Communist clause invoked against them resulting in expulsions from the UMW.

Bob Avakian, chairman, Central Committee, Revolutionary Communist Party. Robert A. Avakian, born March 7, 1943, has been active in radical left activities since his participation in the Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley where he was arrested in the Sproul Hall occupation in December 1964. The son of Alameda County Superior Court Judge Spurgeon Avakian, in 1966 and 1967 Bob Avakian was active in "electoral politics" with the Community for New Politics—CNP—an organization with strong CPUSA and New Left Marxist-Leninist leadership designed to attract liberals and leftists into electing radical candidates. Avakian wrote in the Berkeley Barb, January 27, 1967, that the CNP met the specifications for "the revolutionary Marxist vanguard party." That spring Avakian received 10,490 votes in his unsuccessful bid for election to the Berkeley City Council.

By July 1967, Avakian was moving toward a more militant stand. In July at a meeting of the Bay Area Emergency Action Committee, an organization formed to support the Black Panther Party and other black militants principally by the CPUSA and its youth group, the DuBois Clubs, Avakian circulated a proposal to raise funds to purchase guns for the Black Panthers.

On July 2, 1967, Avakian signed a leaflet of the student organizing committee which called for buying guns for black revolutionaries and organizing poor whites into revolutionary movements. During this period, Avakian was part of a circle of Bay Area Maoists who were still able to work with CPUSA members on Vietnam issues. These included Robert Scheer of Ramparts magazine; his wife, Anne Wells Scheer; and others who later became associated with the Red Family and International Liberation School.

Early in 1969, Avakian, Bruce Franklin, and Steve Hamilton, another veteran of the Free Speech Movement, Vietnam Day Committee and the Progressive Labor Party's Maoist youth movement, formed the Bay Area Revolutionary

Bob Avakian was elected to the SDS national interim committee at the June 1969, SDS convention at which the organization disintegrated. Briefly aligned with the Weatherman faction, he aligned his Revolutionary Union with the RYM-II SDS group from which many current RU/RCP leaders came. It is noted that many of the founding members of the RCP's Maoist rival, the October League,

including its chairman, Mike Klonsky, were also RYM-II leaders.

After trips to Peking and firm strict adherence to the practice and international positions of the Communist Chinese, the Avakian group began nationwide expansion, first incorporating small independent Maoist collectives left over from the SDS collapse.

As a public speaker, Robert Avakian has not improved from his soapboxing stunts at the Richmond oil strike in 1969. His shrill voice which breaks into falsetto in moments of stress, and his rigid, jerking movements at the podium, are reminiscent of a certain Austrian housepainter who led the world into a hellish war 30 years ago.

Totalitarians whether of the Leninist or the Fascist type have much in common. Avakian's minions also had their uniforms—red T-shirts with the ROOB slogan. And the large and disciplined thug squad of Maoist cadres which completely surrounded the stage while their supreme commander spoke clearly were Avakian's brownshirts.

"Comrade Chairman" Avakian's harangue concluded with his likening capitalism, the free enterprise system, to a system of vampires. Said Avakian, the capitalist, like the vampire, "is a creature that should'a died a long time ago." He continued:

These bosses are worse than a pack of vampires. Now do ya get what I'm talking about? (Applause and cheers.)

These capitalists ain't nuthin' but a class of vampires—a lot worse than Dracula. And I'll tell ya somethin', there's only one way to deal with a vampire. You gotta learn the laws that the vampire gives to the system. You gotta learn where its weakness is. You gotta learn the laws it lives by and how he sucks your blood. And then you gotta track him down at night, catch him in his coffin and drive a stake into his heart!

Present in the march of the Revolutionary Communist Party attended by a circle of sycophantic elderly comrades was perhaps the leading U.S. Maoist Communist, William Hinton.

William Howard Hinton, 57, is the gray eminence of the Revolutionary Communist Party. A member of a prominent American Communist family, the Hinton's have rendered service to both the Russian intelligence apparatus and the Chinese Communists for over four decades. Hinton's first China visit was in 1937 as a reporter. In 1945 he worked in Chungking as a propaganda analyst for the Office of War Information where his superiors included Owen Lattimore, John K. Fairbank, and Benjamin Kizer, as the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee noted, all three important figures in the Institute for Pacific Relations—a Soviet intelligence operation—and all three identified in sworn testimony as Communists.

Hinton returned to China in 1947 as an employee of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Within months he was working openly for the Communist Chinese. Hinton's own documents which he brought back with him in 1953 reveal he had joined the Chinese Communist Party, and attended secret purge meetings. Hinton's role as ultimate authority for the Amer-

ican Maoists of the Revolutionary Union was exposed early in 1971 when he traveled from Pennsylvania to mediate in a dispute between Avakian's regulars and Bruce Franklin's Venceremos faction. At that time Hinton was living on a farm near Reading, Pa., and organizing RU cadres.

Shortly afterward, Hinton returned to Communist China for a 7-month period. In September and October 1971, Hinton conducted a group of Maoists from the Black Panther Party and the RU visiting the People's Republic of China. Hinton has also served as a propagandist for the Red Chinese with his books, "Fanshen," 1966, and "Iron Oxen."

Having returned to his native Vermont, Hinton serves as chairman of the United States-China People's Friendship Association, the most important Communist Chinese recruitment apparatus which targets a wide range of radicals, university students and professors, and Government employees to be brought into the PRC orbit.

Hinton's mother, Mrs. Carmelita Chase Hinton, also has interesting connections. Mrs. Hinton is the founder of the Putney School, Putney, Vt., with which Owen Lattimore was once closely involved. Mrs. Hinton accompanied Owen Lattimore's child to the Soviet-sponsored World Youth Festival in 1947. Her Putney School was once a favored site for Peace Corps training. The radical Committee of Returned Volunteers once characterized it as "the best training school in the United States."

Bill Hinton's sister, Jean Hinton Greene Rosner, was an associate of the Nathan Gregory Silvermaster espionage ring and was one of Silvermaster's subordinates in the Department of Agriculture Farm Security Administration in the 1940's.

Another better known sister, Joan Chase Hinton Engst, has also chosen to serve the Chinese Communists. Joan Hinton was part of a Soviet spy ring which had penetrated the Los Alamos atomic project. She began her nuclear physics research while a graduate student at the University of Chicago's Institute for Nuclear Research. She had access to classified information until she left Los Alamos in December 1945. Among those in Joan Hinton's circle in New Mexico was the family of Dr. Robert Oppenheimer. In 1947, Joan Hinton and her husband, Irwin Sidney Engst, were invited to China by Shanghai-based Soviet espionage Gerald Tannenbaum. Since that time, Joan Hinton and her husband have assisted the Communist Chinese with their nuclear program.

The articles follow:

#### THE PEOPLE'S BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION (PBC)

The much publicized, well-organized and amply funded People's Bicentennial Commission (PBC) held a religious service, march and rally in Washington, D.C., on July 4th which were near total failures.

After five years of organizing and media manipulation, the PBC confidently expected 150,000 people and obtained police permits for a crowd of 250,000 persons. At the height

of the rally, 4,000 were present. This disaster was hastily explained by Jeremy Rifkin in a Washington Post interview as "although the crowd was small, it was a quality crowd made up of people in their twenties who have been involved in the left and younger people."

PBC activities commenced with a "religious service" at the Jefferson Memorial at which the biblical jubilee redistribution of property was reinterpreted in contemporary, anti-capitalist terms to fewer than 500 people by a score or more of lay and clerical clowns.

The noon march to the Capitol steps was low key, with about 1,000 participants.

John Henry Faulk was master of ceremonies at the Capitol rally. Among the speakers who droned on into the hot afternoon were Flo Kennedy; Jonathan Kozol; Dolores Huerta; Ed Sadlowski; Kamook Banks of the American Indian Movement; Ellen Gavin, Massachusetts; Jane Fonda; Tom Hayden; Sam Lovejoy; and D.C. city councilmen Marion Barry and Julius Hobson.

The common theme of the speeches was criticism of large multinational corporations and other "excesses of the capitalist system." Tom Hayden, the only non-musician to receive an ovation, said, "We filled the jails; we filled the streets; now let's fill the halls of government."

This said, the PBC concluded its rally with, appropriately, the musicians and speakers joining in a real song and dance act.

#### CITY OF PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

No report on the July 4th events in Philadelphia would be complete without noting the role taken by the police department in that city. Their effective handling of two major and volatile demonstrations simultaneously with a Presidential visit at a time when the city was packed with thousands of tourists was a textbook operation.

GENE HOWARD

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a most tragic event occurred during the recent congressional recess. I was stunned upon learning of the accidental death of Philip E. Howard, a member of the staff of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Gene, as we all called him, spent his entire adult life, following his service in World War II, in behalf of veterans and their families. He had the unique experience of having been an official of a national veterans' organization, the Veterans' Administration, and a staff member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

His dedicated and selfless service for veterans and their families was known throughout the Nation. In his several capacities of leadership he demonstrated a dedication and devotion which will be difficult to surpass. I came to know Gene personally over the years and can state without hesitation that he has left a void in the ranks of veterans whose cause has suffered an irrevocable loss. Let us look at the record of Gene Howard, a most unusual man who will be sorely missed.

Gene was born and educated in Charlottesville, Va., where he attended the University of Virginia. His World War II Army service was in the Philippines



where he was disabled and later discharged in 1946.

He returned, a young veteran with a high love of country, an undying sense of patriotism, and a perception of the problems of veterans adjusting to peace.

Upon returning home to Charlottesville, he joined AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II. He was named adjutant, Department of Virginia AMVETS, in 1948. The next year he came to Washington as the manager of AMVETS national headquarters. In 1953 he became assistant executive director and then served as executive director from 1956 to 1962.

It was during this time that I became aware of his unique managerial ability. The tougher the challenge, the more effective his response. To the astonishment of many he could cut through red-tape and conclude a project in record time—a trait that served him well during his entire career.

Highlights of his service with AMVETS include:

Securing the former home of the late Senator Robert A. Taft for a new national headquarters building, and securing President Harry S. Truman as dedication speaker.

Leadership in obtaining a congressional appropriation to complete the U.S.S. Arizona memorial at Pearl Harbor, an action recognized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator HIRAM FONG of Hawaii.

Developing improvements in the administration of the GI bill which ultimately saved the Government millions of dollars.

Instrumental in establishing the annual AMVETS Silver Helmet Award recognizing distinguished Americans.

Consummating AMVETS participation in the World Veterans Federation.

Involvement in the repatriation of the remains of unknown World War II and Korean servicemen which culminated in reburial of the unknown servicemen at Arlington National Cemetery—a ceremony led by President Eisenhower.

Active in establishing and administering AMVETS memorial scholarships, a forerunner of statutory scholarship and educational benefits for children of veterans.

Establishing present format for regional observances of Veterans Day.

As his activities grew he became known and respected in the international community of veterans. In the early 1960's he was invited by the Republic of South Korea to organize that country's counterpart of our Veterans Administration.

In 1964 Gene was appointed Special Assistant to William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. In this position, he continued to pursue his unswerving interest in veterans and their dependents. The personal devotion he brought to his duties was recognized by all major veterans organizations. During the 4 years he was with the VA he traveled with President Lyndon B. Johnson on many occasions throughout the Nation and to Korea. Gene worked closely with the President, the White House staff, Members of Congress, and

the Veterans' Affairs Committee, particularly myself, as chairman.

He was proud that during his VA tenure he participated in many activities which resulted in increased benefits for veterans and their dependents, such as:

President Johnson's unprecedented veterans message to Congress on January 31, 1967.

The Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967.

The U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission which conducted the Nation's first grassroots study of veterans programs.

President Johnson's second veterans' message to Congress on January 30, 1968.

Improvements in the pension system, survivors' benefits, and the National Service Life Insurance program.

Special program to help Vietnam veterans find employment, and utilize their veterans' rights and benefits.

In 1968 he joined the staff of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. No chairman, no member, no veterans could ask for more dedicated service. The fine talent of Gene Howard is reflected in every activity of the committee. He was tenacious when need be, compassionate at all times, and his droll humor would appear most unexpectedly.

Gene had the faith to accept what life decreed and to carry on through acclamation or adversity. He always gave his best but never compromised his principles. His first obligation was to veterans and he was true to that cause above all. Many who have worked with him will continue in his tradition, but none can replace him.

The Howard family is very close to Mrs. Teague and me. On behalf of the Congress of the United States, I extend deepest sympathy to Gene's wife Beverly, his daughters Debby, Donna, and Leslie, and his sons Paul and Mark.

My friend is gone. I shall miss him.

#### TRIBUTE TO SEYMOUR ROBINSON

#### HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join the Westside Community Center of the Jewish Center Association in paying tribute to Seymour Robinson.

Mr. Robinson will be presented with the Man of the Year award by Mayor Tom Bradley on Thursday, July 29, 1976, at the Health Club Award Night to be held in the Weinberger Auditorium of the Westside Jewish Center.

Seymour Robinson is well deserving of this honor. He has devoted himself to improving relationships between the Jewish community and the black and Chicano communities for the mutual benefit of all. He has been active in movements for school integration and enrichment of educational opportunities. These have been the main thrusts of his very active life, but he has been active in many other areas of social welfare and significance.

He has been president and the organizer of Neighbors Unlimited and helped organize Black Party Neighbors, a group that has worked to develop close ties between the black and Jewish communities living together in the Pico Fairfax area of Los Angeles. He has been chairman, Public Affairs Committee, West Side Jewish Community Center, 1973-75; member, Urban Affairs Committee, L.A. Board of Education; member of the Mayor's Advisory Committee to assist small and minority businesses to obtain city contracts. He has also been a member of the Citizens' Committee for the Pan Pacific Urban Park; member, L.A. City Human Relations Commission, and member of the Parents' Advisory Committee of Fairfax High School.

Seymour's wife Anita is currently a medical social worker with Cedars Sinai Hospital where she has been for the last 20 years. They have two sons, David and Billy.

Seymour Robinson is a warm and compassionate human being. I am pleased to consider him one of my personal friends. He is receiving a well earned tribute.

#### UNIONS BECOMING BELIEVERS

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, unions have become so powerful that they can paralyze a city, interrupt the vital functions of a county, or even shut down various vital commercial functions of our country. There is even a move afoot to organize our Armed Forces, a move so dangerous and irresponsible as to almost be beyond comprehension. If our Armed Forces were to be organized, the leaders of such a union would be in a position to greatly influence the foreign policy of our Nation and to threaten the national security of the United States.

However, the article by the distinguished columnist Virginia Payette in the San Diego Union attests, our citizens are standing up to the municipal unions, demanding responsiveness from those members who are on the public payroll, but use their civic functions as a tool to increase salaries. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues as indicative of a possible public trend by our citizens. I include the article as a portion of my remarks:

#### UNIONS BECOMING BELIEVERS

(By Virginia Payette)

Whoever would have thought the fear of going broke would turn out to be a big plus for our cities? But that's the way it's working out; it's giving them backbone to stand up to the unions.

Not only stand up, but win.

From New York to San Francisco, and a lot of places in between, municipal workers are discovering the public has had it up to here with illegal strikes (policemen, garbage collectors, bus drivers, etc.) for higher pay, fancier fringes, or just to sulk because something doesn't suit them.

Time was, all taxpayers could do was complain. Most mayors, faced with threats from labor to "pay up—or we'll shut down the city," handed over everything but City Hall. (In New York, they even gave that away.)

But things are different now. People are finding out that they and their children and their children's children will be paying off those lush pensions for the next 100 years. And they are restless about future feathering of the public nest.

They're getting their message across to mayors. No more lavish pay hikes. No matter whatever. And City governments, prodded by the spectre of financial ruin, are actually following through.

It's been a great shock to labor bosses. Their big stick—a strike against the public interest—just doesn't have the same clout any more. For one thing, it has become harder and harder to tell whether public employees are working or not.

In San Francisco, they stayed off the job for 38 days to protest a 24-per-cent pay cut and what happened? The city hung in there, the people muddled through, other unions even ignored picket lines—and the workers eventually went back. At reduced pay.

Then came another blow. A judge actually did something about the fact that a municipal union had broken the law. He sentenced four union leaders to five days in the cooler and fined each one \$500. Then he slapped another \$4,000 fine on each of the four local unions involved.

New York City workers have just settled for a two-year contract with a new twist: All the fringes go to the city. Labor leaders bowed to the inevitable (the city is broke) and agreed to \$24 million worth of cuts. A history-making moment.

In Baltimore, where city workers walked out two years ago to protest an offered 4-per-cent pay increase, they're still haggling. But now the city's offering a 2-per-cent hike.

In Detroit, another depressed area, the news is impressive. When half the police force came down with "blue flu" in a snit over an economy layoff of 1,000 officers, the chief found the right medicine: "Get back to work or get fired." It was a new miracle drug. The cops recovered overnight.

"This is the season of darkness for our union," says Jerry Wurf, president of the 750,000-member American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. "The day when unions can deal with problems by major force is over. The business of sitting at the bargaining table and saying that we'll cut off the water if you don't come through, that day is gone."

They realize the fiscal crisis in many cities, big and little, is for real. That mayors aren't stalling when they say the money just isn't there. And that the only increases the public will stand for will be increases in productivity.

HON. LEW DESCHLER

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad occasion indeed for the entire House to have lost the cumulative wisdom and information embodied in our friend Lew Deschler, who occupied a unique place in its parliamentary history.

He was a good friend and a dependable source of information to me through my entire time of service here. His help was especially valuable when I first ar-

rived, in the early years when I lacked familiarity with the details of procedure.

What Lew Deschler did for me he certainly did for many other newcomers through the decades. This service was, of course, in addition to the burden he carried in his function of assistance to the Speaker.

One of my fondest remembrances of him is that of his tremendous sense of humor, a characteristic so helpful in public life. Lew Deschler was an affable human being who will long be remembered.

ROBERT SULLIVAN

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague and personal friend, EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, of Massachusetts, joins me in mourning the loss of one of Massachusetts' finest superior court justices, Robert Sullivan.

In a superlative judicial career that spanned 18 years on the superior court bench, Judge Sullivan presided over more than 100 murder trials and rendered decisions on numerous controversial cases.

EDDIE BOLAND and I remember Robert Sullivan as a man who possessed a witty and charming personality and a judge who brought to his judicial decisions a fairness and flexibility in interpreting the law.

An advocate of court reform, Judge Sullivan was in the forefront of revising the bail procedures. He firmly believed that the present system was structured unfairly against the poor. He often pointed out to friends that "those who go free on bail do so not because they are innocent, but because they are rich enough to purchase their freedom. Those who are detained for the most part are jailed not because they are guilty but because they are too poor to pay a bondsman."

Two significant and recent decisions in Judge Sullivan's career stand out fresh in memory. In December 1972, he sent back to the Boston school committee and the State board of education their plan to racially balance Boston's schools without using massive busing.

In 1975, when the question of the constitutionality of the Massachusetts mandatory-sentence gun control law was before this court, Judge Sullivan ruled in favor of the law's constitutionality. This far-reaching decision was subsequently upheld by the State supreme court.

Like so many parents who influence their children in the pursuit of a distinguishable career, Judge Sullivan's father, the late T. Robert Sullivan, was instrumental in helping his son choose law as a profession. From the time he began his college studies at Harvard, Robert Sullivan wanted to be a judge. Following his graduation from Harvard in 1938, Judge Sullivan attended Boston College Law School from which he was graduated in 1941. He was the first Boston College law graduate to serve on the superior court.

Renowned for his judicial fairness and profound knowledge and dedication to the interpretation of the law, Judge Sullivan was also widely recognized as a competent writer. He was the author of two books and several articles for the Massachusetts Law Quarterly.

EDDIE BOLAND and I extend our sincere condolences and sympathy to Judge Sullivan's lovely wife, Dorothy, to his daughter, Mrs. Charles F. Curran, and to his sister, Mrs. Eleanor Murphy.

ANTICONSERVATIVE SMEAR NETWORK LINKED TO ULTRALEFT, PROVIOLENCE GROUPS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have often discussed the serious problems faced by our country as a result of the destruction of local police and Federal Government intelligence-gathering abilities. However, the campaign against intelligence gathering on subversive and terrorist groups has had one useful aspect. It has revealed the strange and complex links between the ultraleft pro-terrorist groups and the long-established smear apparatus which for decades has attacked and lied about conservatives and anti-Communists.

The Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate—OC-5—is a center for disseminating attacks on the Central Intelligence Agency. OC-5 and its publication, Counterspy, have been blamed for having marked out the CIA station chief in Athens for assassination.

The spring, 1976, issue of Counterspy contains a list of alleged CIA agents at the U.S. Embassy in London. The home addresses of these people who include young clerks and secretaries are given public exposure. Counterspy's list had been provided by the chief Trotskyist Communist group in England, the International Marxist Group—IMG. The IMG is the British section of the proterrorist Fourth International, the coordinating body for the Trotskyist revolutionary movement. The IMG is headed by Tariq Ali, an employee of the Transnational Institute of the Institute for Policy Studies—IPS. IPS has close and interlocking relationships with Counterspy, with the Center for National Security Studies—CNSS—and with the National Lawyers Guild—NLG. Tariq Ali has publicly proclaimed his support for political terrorism; and puts his theory into practice by serving the Fourth International and the IMG as a contact man for terrorist groups in England, Ireland, the Middle East, and Latin America.

The spring, 1976, issue of Counterspy also provided an interesting set of interlocking links between the OC-5 operation and the other, older anti-anti-Communist and anticongressive groups. Counterspy published a defamatory scurrilous attack on this Congressman, on a member of my staff, Mrs. Louise Rees, and on her husband, John Rees. In attacking John Rees, publisher of the



Information Digest, for publishing accurate information about the activities of the terrorist groups and their supporters, the OC-5 Counterspy group revealed they had consulted a number of "experts."

The OC-5 "experts" included Frank J. Donner, identified on three occasions as a Communist Party, U.S.A.—CPUSA—member, and who, as director of the ACLU's Anti-Surveillance Project and member of the Counterspy advisory board, is a prime mover in the attack on the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and Wesley McCune, whom OC-5 identified as a "veteran analyst of America's right wing."

McCune operates an anticonservative, anti-anti-Communist smear outfit called Group Research. In a recent telephone conversation, McCune admitted that on numerous occasions he had received requests for information from Counterspy and had gladly cooperated by providing information.

Group Research has operated for a decade and a half as a well funded spy apparatus. Its targets have been a broad range of conservative and anti-Communist individuals and organizations, particularly those who have interfered with Soviet foreign policy goals and who have in no way advocated violence or been connected with unfriendly foreign powers.

It is interesting to note that many who use Group Research's information are vehemently opposed to any investigation or intelligence gathering on terrorists and their proviolence supporters, as well as those who serve as agents of such unfriendly foreign powers as the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Communist China.

McCune himself was involved in the early 1960's in a scheme to use politically raised and laundered money to conduct a smear campaign against conservatives and the Presidential candidacy of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. An executive of the public relations firm hired to promote the smear allegations was quoted as saying, "if we did in 1974 what we did in 1964, we would be answering questions before some congressional committee."—quoted by Fred W. Friendly, former president of CBS News, New York Times Magazine, March 30, 1975.

This early version of "Watergate" included attacks on the licenses of radio stations carrying programs displeasing to the left; a series of anticonservative radio broadcasts which were never identified as having been paid for by funds raised for political candidates; and a mudslinging book attacking Senator GOLDWATER written by Fred Cook in cooperation with Wesley McCune which was subsidized with secret funds supplied by the Democratic National Committee.

Group Research and its network grew out of a memorandum written by Victor Reuther and delivered by his brother, Walter Reuther, then president of the United Auto Workers to U.S. Attorney General Robert Kennedy on December 19, 1961. The Reuther memorandum

suggested a concerted attack on American conservatives and urged Kennedy to utilize Government agencies to carry out this attack.

Many of the allegations—some of them quite untrue—leveled against our intelligence agencies in recent months were the very tactics advocated in the Reuther memorandum. For example, while the FBI is being criticized for infiltrating terrorist groups and Soviet-controlled organizations such as the Communist Party, U.S.A. and its fronts, Reuther recommended that the FBI be used to infiltrate nonviolent conservative groups. Wrote Reuther:

It is not known the extent to which the Federal Bureau of Investigation has planted undercover agents inside the radical right movement as it has inside the Communist Party and its allied organizations. If it has already done so, the information would be readily available upon which to draw up charges for a hearing against one or more of the radical right groups. If the Bureau has not as yet infiltrated these organizations, a longer time will of course be necessary to obtain the information for the charges, although much of the needed information is available through public sources.

Among the organizations that Reuther wanted falsely charged as "subversive" was the John Birch Society which has never advocated violence, which has never violated any laws, and which abhors totalitarianism.

Reuther further recommended in his memorandum that "private" smear groups be established to aid in the campaign. He said:

Private agencies can do much, too, to identify and expose the radical right. Indeed, in the long run the extent of participation by private agencies in this struggle is more likely to determine its outcome than anything the Government can do. The press, television, church, labor, civic, political and other groups whose constitutional freedom is directly involved must carry the prime burden in this struggle. But the purpose of the memorandum is to consider possible administration policies and programs rather than those of private groups. Furthermore, affirmative Administration policies and programs can set the backdrop against which private activity is most likely to succeed.

The two major anti-anti-Communist anticonservative networks which grew out of the Reuther memorandum were Group Research and the National Committee for Civic Responsibility which pretended to be a nonpartisan group but was set up with \$25,000 of laundered money from the Democratic National Committee. Half the NCCR budget was paid by "major Democratic party contributors at the direction of the Democratic National Committee." [Friendly, op. cit.]

Much of the NCCR budget in 1964 was paid out to Group Research for developing anti-Goldwater smear material used in the election campaign. After the election campaign, NCCR closed down.

On November 18, 1966, a "new" organization made its appearance, the Institute for American Democracy—IAD. It is interesting to note that one third of the IAD's sponsors were previously sponsors

of the National Committee for Civic Responsibility. Among them was NCCR head Arthur Larson, characterized by Charles R. Baker as "the most prominent functioning liberal in the Eisenhower cabinet."

Baker himself, a former public relations man in Toledo, Ohio, who had been assistant director of public relations of the UAW and editor of the UAW newspaper during the 1950's and a protégé of the Reuther brothers, was selected as IAD executive director.

Baker continued the calumnious attacks on conservatives and anti-Communists, and has carried on as IAD head for the past 10 years. In November 1973, IAD sponsored a fundraising gathering for Group Research. In the IAD newsletter, Homefront, which Baker edits and writes, Baker admitted at the time that the Group Research files which had previously been used by the National Committee for Civic Responsibility to supply anti-Goldwater material during the 1964 campaign were now available to his IAD.

An undated IAD brochure entitled "Insurance Against Disaster" which was distributed in the early 1970's boasted that the Institute for American Democracy had "a million records" on conservatives. According to the brochure, "IAD is the only national body with its own files and ready access to just about all the files on the Far Right. Our own material is backstopped by Group Research which has been collecting reports on the Far Right since 1962."

Contributions to the IAD smear organization were tax exempt. And herein lies a story. In November 1968, a report in News and Views, published by the Church League of America, revealed that the Institute for American Democracy was not, in fact, founded in 1966. A check of Internal Revenue Service files revealed that the IAD was established in 1943 by the Anti-Defamation League—ADL—of B'nai B'rith. The IAD had been dormant until 1966 when it resurfaced as part of the anticonservative attack apparatus.

Herbert Romerstein, a member of my staff, states that the ADL is entirely autonomous and is not under the control of the respectable civic organization, B'nai B'rith, as many are led to believe. ADL, with a multimillion dollar budget, is led by a group of people who are "liberals first and Jews second."

Romerstein was particularly incensed that during the 1960's when the black militant movement had developed strong anti-Semitic tendencies, threatening and assaulting Jewish victims, ADL was silent. Only after the facts of black militant anti-Semitism were well publicized, and after other prominent liberals such as Albert Shanker had spoken out against it, did the ADL see fit to join the protest.

Baker used the IAD to attack any conservative or anti-Communist that was hurting the Red cause. In March 1972, IAD joined the leftist chorus attacking the House Committee on Internal Security. IAD used information which they had obtained from the Communist-front

National Committee Against Repressive Legislation—NCARL—formerly the National Committee To Abolish HUAC.

Other targets of IAD in the March 1972 edition of their publication, Homefront, were the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and the Subversive Activities Control Board. These three Federal agencies were targets of a long-term Communist program of abolition. At this time, only the Senate subcommittee still exists.

Baker has now announced the demise of IAD. He is continuing his work as a freelance organizer and troublemaker. In recent months, while still running IAD, Baker has been active in Arkansas trying to repeal that State's right-to-work law. He recently circulated a memorandum trying to organize a campaign to defeat conservative candidates in the forthcoming elections. His memo met with little success as even the usual supporters of Baker and company shied away from this throwback to the days of Watergate dirty tricks.

The link between the OC-5/Counterspy group and the anticommunist smear organizations is of particular significance when considering OC-5's relationships with Cuban Communist intelligence apparatus—through their advisory board member Philip Agee—and a variety of violence-prone, terror-supporting domestic and international revolutionary groups.

When Counterspy attacked the publisher of the Information Digest and his wife, a member of my staff, they did so with the active cooperation of William Haddad and Thomas Burton, employees of New York State Assembly Speaker Stanley Steingut. Steingut is presently under indictment for selling jobs. Steingut's patronage employee, Haddad, became rich by marrying an heiress and ripping off the Federal poverty programs. Haddad first worked for the Office of Economic Opportunity investigating poverty program abuses. After learning "the trade," he left to set up his own consulting firm to milk Federal agency funds.

These sleazy politicians took their information on the Reeses and the Information Digest, much of it inaccurate and some of it maliciously defamatory, directly to totalitarian Marxist-Leninist and proterrorist groups whose activities had been reported in the Information Digest. These groups included the Trotskyist Communist Socialist Workers Party, the U.S. section of the terror-supporting Fourth International; the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, a Communist Party front; the National Lawyers Guild—NLG—which serves as the principal legal defense group for domestic terrorists and which supports the principal of revolutionary armed struggle tactics; the New Left think-tank Institute for Policy Studies—IPS—which maintains ties with a broad range of foreign and domestic revolutionary and terrorist organizations including the Weather Underground and the Palestine Liberation Organization; the Center for National Security Studies—CNSS—which has taken much of its staff from IPS circles and whose director, Robert L. Borosage, is both a

member of the NLG and a trustee of IPS; and of course the Organizing Committee for a Fifth Estate, which serves as an outlet for material developed by IPS and the CNSS, among other sources.

Since that time, the OC-5 and its allies have provided information with still added inaccuracies and slanders to the Marxist-Lenin Guardian newspaper; to the support organization for the Symbionese Liberation Army and other at-large revolutionary terrorist cadres, the Bay Area Research Collective—BARC—and to groups of the violence-prone lunatic-left fringe such as the National Caucus of Labor Committees—NCLC—and the Youth International Party—YIP. In turn, these groups and others have launched vitriolic attacks on this Congressman, his staff member, and her husband, adding malignant, fantasized reminiscence to innuendo, fabrication, and flatout lie.

It is noted that despite the claims by the revolutionary and lunatic left that the Information Digest "invaded their privacy," a review of the Digest volumes, regularly published since 1967, discloses no instances where reports were made of private or personal "nonpolitical" activities. The ultra-left stories assert that John Rees and his Information Digest reporters achieved an indepth penetration of scores of organizations, indicating that they would have had ample personal information with which to sensationalize Information Digest articles had they so wished.

The most recent story attacking my staff researcher and her husband makes a personal threat against them. The article appeared in the Washington, D.C., counterculture tabloid, Newsworks—July 15-23, 1976, issue No. 23—a publication which like Counterspy has close links to the Institute for Policy Studies. Newsworks reveals that it has received information on the Reeses from the Bay Research Collective—BARC—which serves as the overt support apparatus for several underground terrorist groups functioning on the west coast.

This counterculture newspaper, serving as a link to the west coast terrorists of the New World Liberation Front which has already taken responsibility for gunning down and murdering two persons, a woman and a man it believed were assisting law enforcement in California, ask about the Reeses: "The question is, of course, why is this couple roaming the streets of Washington?"

Given the violent proclivities of the ultra-left, a number of precautions have been instituted to frustrate any direct action which they may envisage.

We are approaching another election year campaign. I think it is important for my colleagues to be aware that the Charles Bakers and the Wesley McCunes are still operating in the political underworld.

With laundered money, Watergate style political tactics, and connections with the violence-oriented ultra-left, they remain a threat to American free elections while their collaborators continue to undermine our national security. Candidates approached by these denizens of the political underworld should pub-

licly repudiate them and refuse their support.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

**HON. HENRY J. NOWAK**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week was authorized by Public Laws 86-90 in 1959, which designated the third week in July as the period for official annual recognition of those without the basic human right of self-determination. It is particularly appropriate immediately following our Bicentennial to call to the attention of the world the plight of these people.

It is difficult for us, as Americans, to comprehend fully the anxieties of the captive nations, particularly when we have so many freedoms which so often are taken for granted. However, in observing Captive Nations Week, we should become more aware of the unquenchable thirst that these people continue to possess. I talk not of the thirst that may be quenched with a glass of cool water, rather, the thirst of desire, the desire to speak without fear of retaliation, the desire to worship as one pleases, the desire to enjoy traditional cultures. The depth of these desires has been demonstrated on many occasions during the past three decades, most recently in Poland where, for the third time in 20 years, Polish workers have taken to the streets to object to Communist-induced economic conditions.

We can relate this type of dissent to America some 200 years ago, when we had a similar burning obsession for freedom from foreign control. However, in this nuclear era, the solution does not lie in violent revolution. Rather, it should lie in meaningful, two-way negotiations and diplomacy where equitable solutions can be constructed at the bargaining table, as opposed to destruction on the battlefield.

Ours is a unique society that cannot be universally adopted, but that is not to say that our basic principles of freedom and equality cannot be duplicated. This is precisely the desire of many of the nations that are entrapped within the Communist web. By observing Captive Nations Week for the 18th consecutive year we reaffirm our interest in helping fulfill the aspirations of the captive states. However, the United States should not limit interest and concern for captive nations to 1 week per year, since Communist dominance and influence is not exclusively maintained in the Baltic or Eastern European areas. Rather, the Soviets seek to exert a great deal of influence throughout Europe and Asia, with operations throughout Africa and Latin America.

On August 1, 1975, the Helsinki accord was signed with great intentions, but, it is apparent that the Soviet Union is not completely honoring the obligations established in those agreements. We must follow through with this docu-



ment on human rights and vigorously urge the Soviets to meet their commitments. If we allow this pattern of Soviet behavior to continue, we may find ourselves confronted with a Communist sphere of influence that is too large to deal with effectively. Thus we must keep our "guard" up, require a two-way return, and firmly insist that Soviet Russia abide by her international obligations.

As we proceed toward our Tricentennial, we must not forget that a half a world away there are those that are regarded as "captive," some for several decades. As the epitome of democracy, it is our moral obligation not only to recognize the plight of the captive states but also to prevent their flame of freedom from being extinguished. If there is to be "peaceful coexistence," it must be without the existence of tyranny.

### BUREAUCRATIC ARROGANCE

#### Hon. Theodore M. (Ted) Risenhoover

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. RISENHOOVER. Mr. Speaker, the consensus of opinion in Oklahoma—and surely across this land—is that the Federal Government has reached unreasonable size and power.

In the past few weeks, I have testified in formal hearings before two agencies of Government—the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal Trade Commission—strongly protesting rules and regulations.

In reaction to the arrogance of the bureaucracy, this House has amended legislation requiring that rules and regulations be returned to Congress where either House can exercise a veto within 60 days. We all are aware of the danger of trampling the principle of separation of powers. The people are more fearful of being trampled by the powers.

The position of local and State government bodies has been most clearly stated by the distinguished speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives, the Honorable William P. Willis. Transportation Secretary William T. Coleman, Jr., inquired with Speaker Willis for comments about certain alternatives to the proposals for State mandatory safety belt usage laws. Speaker Willis replied:

The Oklahoma House of Representatives has demonstrated a number of times in recent history that they are almost unanimously opposed to federal agencies mandating that we take affirmative action on matters mandated by the agencies, or by Congress also.

Leave the matter of safety regulations up to us on the state level and if we want to be free to suffer the consequences of our failure to protect ourselves, let us have that freedom.

You cannot comprehend how abhorrent edicts coming down from Washington are to a supposedly free people.

You requested input from here on the proposed safety changes. The above is my contribution.

### OVERRIDE URGED FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION VETO

#### HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, Thursday the House will vote on a matter which directly affects the basic principles of the prerogatives and responsibilities of Congress.

The President has vetoed the entire fiscal year 1977 military construction authorization bill, objecting to provisions providing for congressional involvement in decisions concerning closures and realignments of military facilities.

The provisions, generally referred to at the time of their consideration in the House as the "O'Neill amendment," was introduced by our esteemed majority leader and approved overwhelmingly. They represent an accumulation of frustrations by Members of Congress after many years of experiencing questionable facilities changes implemented by the Department of Defense, dislocations of many thousands of Government employees, and severe disruptions of local economies, all affected without the benefit of justification or outside review.

Such actions have occurred in my district of Guam where the military services are the dominant factor in the local economy. They have occurred in many other districts in all areas of our Nation.

Presently, one service or another, for reasons rarely explained in any detail, makes a decision. That service then makes a public announcement and within weeks hundreds, even thousands, of Federal employees are summarily discharged, families dislocated, local economies disrupted. Congressional inquiries are generally responded to with vague rationales citing "economics" or "improved efficiencies." Local opposition receives only courtesy attention.

Too often these decisions, imperiously implemented, prove to be poorly thought out, and in fact, result in inefficiencies and increased costs.

This practice has been allowed to continue too long. Too much hardship has been unnecessarily created to allow it to go on unchecked.

In opposing the provisions of this bill concerning base realignments, the administration contends they would interfere with proper operations of the military services and usurp powers of the Executive.

I do not agree. To me these provisions are a model of restraint and moderation. They do not require congressional approval of base realignments but merely allow for congressional review. This bill does not require any congressional action at all, but only that the Department of Defense present justification for major changes. If such proposals are in fact based on sound reasoning and judgment, there should be no objection to explaining them to Congress, the direct representatives of the citizens and areas affected, and to the citizens themselves.

This bill would require at least 1 year

from the time a base change plan is announced until it could be implemented. In view of the immense local effects such changes have and the low immediacy of the needs for realignments, this is a minimum time to allow for necessary adjustments to be made to ease the impact on individuals and local governments. It is rare that the need for immediate military action offsets the harm caused by precipitous realignments.

As for any impropriety of involvement of Congress in base changes, such arguments are groundless. It is clearly up to Congress to approve establishment of any base or facility. Congressional action is required to provide funding for establishment and operations. Congressional involvement, certainly to the limited degree provided for in this bill, is justified for major changes in operational levels, changes which have as much impact as a base establishment.

It is to their representatives in Congress that citizens look for explanations for Federal actions which adversely affect them, not to anonymous officials in the Department of Defense. It is to their representatives in Congress that the citizens have given the responsibility for protecting their welfare, not the Department of Defense. Members of Congress should do no less than require justifications and the right of review of actions so severely affecting their constituents.

I would point out that the provisions to which the administration objects were very carefully constructed. Minor routine changes of normal operations were specifically not included. Allowances for extraordinary circumstances when the requirements would be waived were included.

The provisions of this military construction bill concerning base and facilities changes are needed and justified. The objections of the administration are not valid and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote to override the Presidential veto.

Thank you.

### EULOGY TO LEWIS DESCHLER

SPEECH OF

#### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1976

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost a true public servant with the passing of Lewis Deschler, former Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives. It was my privilege to know Lew, whose knowledge of parliamentary procedures and advice to nine Speakers of the House, earned him an outstanding reputation as a man of honor and high intelligence.

For 46 years Lew Deschler worked behind the scenes without seeking publicity. He was always ready to discuss complex rules with any Member of this body and he knew the precedents of House procedures better than any person.

Two years ago Lew retired as Parliamentarian. Today he is no longer with

us but his career will always be remembered and will serve as a model for all future House Parliamentarians and all public officials.

I join with Lew's many friends and admirers in the House in extending sympathies to his wife, Virginia, and his children.

#### ENERGY ACTION NO. 5

### HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to alert this body to the fact that we have today received from Mr. Frank G. Zarb, Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration, Energy Action No. 5, an amendment to the FEA price and allocation regulations which would exempt naphthas and gas oils from mandatory price and allocation regulations. Pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, EPCA, unless either House disapproves this action within 15 calendar days of session, this exemption will go into effect. The last day for either House to act will be August 4.

I have the transmittal letter accompanying the Energy Action No. 5 which I would like to offer for inclusion in the RECORD. I understand that by tomorrow, the FEA intends to submit to each Member of this body copies of the energy action, a copy of FEA's technical report containing the findings and views supporting such action, and an executive summary outlining the projected effects of the exemption of naphthas and gas oils from controls.

I urge each of you to give careful consideration to this energy action and the supporting documents so that we may make a sound judgment regarding this important matter.

The letter follows:

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1976.

Re: Exemption of Naphthas, Gas Oils and "Other Products" from the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations (Energy Action No. 5).

HON. CARL ALBERT,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On June 10, 1976, the Federal Energy Administration gave notice of a proposal to exempt naphthas, gas oils and "other products" (as defined in 10 CFR 211.182 and 10 CFR 211.202, including, in addition to naphthas and gas oils, carbon black feedstocks, benzene, toluene, mixed xylenes, hexane, lubricants, greases, special naphthas (solvents), lubricant base stock oils and process oils) from the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations. Written comments from interested persons were invited through July 7, 1976, and a public hearing regarding the proposal was held on July 1 and 2, 1976.

FEA has now completed its consideration of all the information available in this proceeding and has determined that the proposal to exempt naphthas, gas oils and "other products" should be adopted. The amendment exempts the enumerated products from FEA allocation and price regula-

tions, except for those restricting the use of naphtha as a synthetic natural gas (SNG) plant feedstock. The question of whether to remove restrictions on the use of naphtha as a SNG feedstock will be separately considered following completion and analysis of an environmental impact statement currently being prepared.

As required by section 455 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, Pub. L. 94-163 (EPCA), which added section 12 to the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, as amended (EPAA), each amendment exempting a refined product category from regulation must be submitted separately to each House of the Congress for review pursuant to section 551 of the EPCA. FEA is, therefore, herewith submitting the amendment exempting naphthas, gas oils and "other products" (which are a single product category under the EPCA) to the Senate and is concurrently submitting this amendment to the House of Representatives, for Congressional review.

The findings and views supporting this amendment, which are required by section 455 of the EPCA, are set forth in the enclosed document entitled "Findings and Views Concerning the Exemption of Naphtha, Gas Oil and 'Other Products' from the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation and Price Regulations".

The Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration has been delegated by the President all the authority granted to him by the EPAA (E.O. 11790, 39 F.R. 23185, June 27, 1974).

Unless disapproved by either House of Congress as provided by section 551 of the EPCA, the enclosed amendment will be effective September 1, 1976.

Sincerely,

FRANK G. ZARB,  
Administrator.

#### OUR SENIOR CITIZENS—THE FORGOTTEN MINORITY

### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, during my years of service in the Congress and as a former State legislator, I have sought to alleviate the hardships of one of our most distressed minority groups—our senior citizens.

While valiant efforts have been made on behalf of our Nation's residents, age 65 and over, not enough is being accomplished. The needs of our elderly residents are many and what we have been able to provide has fallen short of the goal.

The Older Americans Act provides us with the opportunity to break through inaction and delay—to make the lives of our senior citizens better and more rewarding.

On July 12, 1976, at the County Building in Goshen, N.Y., I was pleased to be able to participate in a public hearing on the preplan abstract of New York State's plan for programs on aging under title III of the Older Americans Act.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I request the insertion of my remarks before the New York State Office of the Aging in order to remind

my colleagues of the need to make life better for our senior citizens—our most overlooked and overburdened minority group.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

Representatives of the State of New York Office of The Aging, Mrs. Cortese, Orange County Officials and our representatives of senior citizen group.

Thank you for affording me this opportunity to comment on this PrePlan Abstract for Title III of the Older Americans Act. The testimony received here today is vitally important and should be fully considered in the State's Plan prior to submission to the Governor's office and prior to the Federal Government for final approval.

The PrePlan objectives are goals we all have been seeking for some time, including:

1. The need to lower housing costs for our older Americans.
2. The need to increase employment opportunities for our Older Citizens.
3. The need to more effectively serve our Older Americans in the areas of recreation, nutrition, planning and in coordinating academic training and improving nursing home care.

As we enter our nation's third century, there is a vast opportunity for working to assist our elderly persons. It was Ben Franklin who said that the only two things that are certain in life are Death and Taxes . . . I'd like to add a third . . . and that is growing old gracefully . . . since we all look forward to enjoying our golden years, all of us should be doing more to help ease the burdens of those years.

There are approximately 20 million people in our nation who are 60 years of age and older. It has been projected that by the year 2000, we will have more than 30 million Senior Citizens. They represent one of the largest and most troubled segments of our citizenry. While some expect that when you turn sixty five, you will be leaving life to the young people, there are many others who recognize that this vast storehouse of experience and energy must not be wasted. To avoid neglecting our Senior Citizens, it is incumbent that we reevaluate our policies and programs for the elderly.

Despite the good works and accomplishments of our local, state and federal offices and agencies of the aging, we have only scratched the surface. There is so much more to do, and I am certain that our local aging director, Ann Cortese, concurs.

Congress, in adopting the Older Americans Act of 1965, has underscored its objective of developing at community level comprehensive, coordinated service to meet the needs of older persons.

Under the older American Act amendments of 1973, which made provisions for a national network of aging agencies, the states have the annual responsibility of setting forth their objectives for the utilization of their funds and to indicate how they intend to go about implementing their action programs.

During the 94th Congress, significant legislation affecting our Senior Citizens was adopted, authorizing the extension through 1978 of the Older Americans Act, adding Title IX to that Act which provides for community service employment for Older Americans, approving demonstration grants for home health care services, and the establishment of an HEW committee on mental health and illness of the elderly. While some progress has been made, there are so many more areas to attack, so many burdens on our senior citizens that need attention:

- Escalating property taxes.
- Nutritional and shelter needs.



The need for home health care and more adequate services in nursing homes.

Social Security reforms to remove earnings limitations and to prevent reductions of veterans benefits.

I feel quite strongly about the restriction in our Social Security law calling for a reduction in social security benefits once a retired person earns more than \$2,400 a year. This law encourages dependence, when we should be giving the fullest incentives to self support and self reliance.

Probably one of the most critical problems confronting the senior citizens of New York State and elsewhere, is their inability to stretch their fixed incomes to meet the rising cost of living and the burdens of continually rising realty taxes.

More and more of our Older Americans are distressed about the imminent threat of the loss of their homes because of the escalation of realty taxes.

In the Congress, I have introduced and have sought the passage of legislation providing property tax relief by way of "Circuit Breakers" and through refundable tax credits.

But so, too, must the States act in that direction. New York States' senior citizen property tax qualification of \$6,500 of income is anachronistic and should be increased to a more realistic level. The State should also be serving other methods of providing sorely needed tax relief to our senior citizens.

Accordingly, I urge the State Office for the Aging to make the realty tax reform a priority project for analysis and action.

So, too, improved health services, including the development of a sound home health care program and more adequate nursing home services, the need to provide more adequate rail and bus transportation services in our less populated areas, the urgent need for adequate, reasonably priced housing and the need to assist our older citizens in finding employment opportunities, are all high priority needs for our elderly.

Too many of our nation's senior citizens are without sufficient income to meet their daily needs, too many lack proper daily nutrition, adequate housing, sound health care and the peace of mind from financial problems that they deserve in their golden years.

These are some of the critical problems which we must attack and resolve.

These are some of the needs of the elderly which our local, state and federal agencies must correct and which I urge for consideration and inclusion in the State's Plan for Programs on Aging.

#### 100 YEARS OF SPECIALTY STEEL— CRUCIBLE'S CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

**HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, as all of us know, a great deal of time and attention has been spent in this Chamber on the important deliberations surrounding the very critical issue of specialty steel imports.

The adoption of quotas affecting this industry will have a salutary effect on the employment posture within the 33rd Congressional District, and the principal beneficiaries will be the many employees of the Crucible Steel Specialty Metals Division at Syracuse.

The company's future has been thus strengthened and it is all the more significant that this important milestone in their history comes at a time when they are about to observe a most important anniversary, Crucible Steel in Syracuse is observing its 100th anniversary.

Crucible has prepared a special centennial booklet outlining the company's role as a producer of specialty metals and, more important, as a vital factor in the economy of our area and as a good neighbor.

I am pleased to offer for your consideration a condensation of Crucible's first 100 years.

One hundred years of service to America—that is what Crucible Specialty Metals Division of Colt Industries proudly celebrates in this country's Bicentennial Year.

Just as the roots of our own great country lie in England, so do the early roots of Crucible's development. In 1776, the year our Founding Fathers were drafting the Declaration of Independence, the predecessor of Crucible was being built in Sheffield, England, under the name of Naylor & Sanderson.

It was not until 100 years later, in 1876, that the true forerunner of the Crucible plant as we know it today was built in Syracuse, N.Y. That location was chosen for its proximity to water and rail transportation systems, including New York State's Erie Canal.

Since that time, Crucible has become a leader in specialty steels, contributing not only to making America a great industrial nation, but to helping build a prosperous and healthy Syracuse. An integral part of the community for these past 100 years, Crucible has helped broaden the tax base and provided a steady payroll and strong work force for Syracuse. All of these efforts have helped maintain a healthy social and economic climate in the community.

In addition to these many contributions, Crucible has carried the influence of Syracuse industry across the country. Many "firsts" in the steelmaking industry have originated from the Crucible plant in Syracuse.

Crucible was the first steel company in America to use the Heroult electric arc furnace, which made steel production more economical and efficient. It was the first to commercially produce vacuum-melted steels, which helped build this country's expanding aircraft industry. It was also the first to produce a new generation of superior high-speed tool steels made possible through Crucible's scientific particle metallurgy research.

Crucible has not only contributed to the science of steelmaking in these ways, but it has also played an important role in the development of the history of this great Nation and of Syracuse in the past 100 years. The critical materials produced at Crucible helped bring America through the devastation of two world wars and economic collapses, as well as through the big growth periods.

In 1900, when 13 steel firms merged to become the new Crucible Steel Co. of America, a wider range of steel prod-

ucts and higher quality work as available. Skills and money could be allocated more wisely and efficiently.

When the Heroult electric arc furnace was first used in 1906, the alloy steels that were produced supplied the burgeoning automotive industry with better performance steels.

The breakthrough metallurgy research Crucible was carrying on then, at the turn of this century, resulted in the important development of vanadium high-speed steels, the standard the world still follows today.

It was these and other high-quality steels that supplied our country with materiel for World War I. In the years following the war, Crucible was these to help bring our country back to its feet, just as it played a major role in bringing industry back to its former strength in the rebuilding years of the thirties after the devastating stock market crash of 1929.

In World War II, Crucible was one of the busiest industries, producing much-needed steel for our Armed Forces and providing employment opportunities for the Syracuse community. In honor of its outstanding achievements in wartime production, Crucible was given the Army-Navy E Production Award with Service Star.

When important advances in steel production came in the fifties and sixties, Crucible was one of the first to take advantage of them. The processes of vacuum-melting steels and producing more uniform rolled products proved very important to our Nation. The vacuum-melting process produced a high-strength steel with superior fatigue and impact strength. The rolled products were characterized by closer uniform tolerances and improved surface quality.

Crucible is still maintaining its role in developing the best specialty steels in this country. In 1971, after years of research and development, Particle Metallurgy became a reality, resulting in the commercial production of a new generation of high-speed tool steels.

Today, with its computer control system, Crucible will be able to calculate metallurgical formulas faster and more precisely than ever before.

Even though Crucible is proud of all of its advancements made in the science of steelmaking, one of the contributions it is most proud of is the pioneering role it has taken in combating pollution. As early as 1967, Crucible had taken steps to investing a quarter of a million dollars to fight air and water pollution.

In 1969, a new forging process was installed, along with a pollution control device on the existing coal-fire boiler, which drastically reduced air pollutants. From 1973-75, the company has invested \$4.5 million to install new air and water pollution control systems.

In addition to the concern Crucible has shown for the environment and for the economic growth of the Syracuse community, it is one of the first industries to be involved in developing energy resources. Crucible is forging ahead to seek its own natural gas supply in surrounding areas. Should gas be found, it

will help provide job continuity for employees, reliable steel supplies to customers, and an extra source of natural gas for households and area business. The steps Crucible is taking should serve as a good example to other industries.

The success of Crucible's first 100 years has been due to the efforts of dedicated and skilled workers from the Syracuse community. For a century, they have made quality their first priority—quality that has enhanced the Syracuse area and the United States greatly in this Bicentennial Year.

## CANCER FROM SYNFUELS

### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues thoughtful and concerned testimony of the Scientists' Institute for Public Information regarding the seriousness of potential health hazards connected with premature development of synthetic fuels.

I would hope that the need for further investigation about cancer causing materials associated with oil shale and coal gasification would lead my fellow Members to join me in opposing the enactment of H.R. 12112, the \$4, or \$6, or \$11½ billion loan guarantee program for the development of synthetic fuel:

TESTIMONY ON H.R. 12112—SUBMITTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND POWER COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 28, 1976

(By Diane Yale Sauter)

The Scientists' Institute for Public Information (SIPI) intends, in this testimony, to comment upon the internal conflict exhibited by ERDA in the presentation of its synthetic fuels program. ERDA seems to be of two minds, with one admitting there is no doubt of a definite cancer risk and meticulously defining its nature, and the other straining to charge ahead immediately with full commercialization. Meanwhile, industry is able to exploit the situation to its own benefit. It is reasonable to expect ERDA to resolve its own confusion and formulate a clear and consistent position before requesting Congress to consider funding of its program under H.R. 12112.

The administration of ERDA is actively seeking \$4 billion loan guarantee authority and authorization to promote full-scale synfuels demonstration projects. At the same time, ERDA's bio-medical research staff acknowledges that data is lacking to conduct a cost/benefit analysis of the synfuels program. That data would include quantification of the health effects and population size that would be exposed by the demonstration projects as well as full commercialization. ERDA's biomedical research efforts have just recently been reprogrammed to explore the ability—which they admit—of synfuels technology to increase the rate of cancer in workers and the public.

The staff is only now in the process of collecting printed references which have long been available on what they call "deleterious impacts" of synfuels production and use. ERDA labs are only beginning to identify the carcinogenic potential of the agents released

in these technologies, to determine their composition and size, to characterize their activity and interactions, the degree of their toxicity, the possibility of recovery from their effects. They are cooperating with other agencies, so that studies just designed and initiated by the Environmental Protection Agency would be available to them—studies to characterize potential plant emissions, survey the adequacy of existing protective equipment, and determine the need for new equipment.

From what is known so far, ERDA's biomedical staff is able to state unequivocally that in the developmental phase—what we are talking about in the loan guarantee program—occupational exposure to potentially hazardous organic and inorganic agents will occur; that these agents will be found in process streams, products and effluents of the facilities; that some, the polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, are known to be carcinogenic, and that others not yet characterized are suspect, but that most have not been evaluated for mutagenic, teratogenic, or carcinogenic activity! They also state that the general population near demonstration or commercial facilities will be exposed.

Yet they are able to declare with premeditation that detection and characterization of hazardous agents is an important part of the strategy during the development phase to secure environmentally acceptable technologies. Although workers will be assured union scale wages for working on demonstration projects, what premium will they and local communities be paid for participating in this unprecedented experimentation?

In no testimony that we have seen before Congress has the administration of ERDA named these very real cancer risks and their costs, although environmentally caused cancer is becoming acknowledged as an emerging national epidemic. Parenthetically, the state of New Jersey is in process of determining whether there is a direct connection between the high concentration of chemical industries and its cancer mortality rate, which is the highest in the nation. It is expecting Federal government grants to help pay the millions needed to find retrospective answers and institute remedial measures.

Robert Fri, in his May 25, 1976 testimony before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, is still referring vaguely to the value of the demonstration program in providing vital information on "environmental acceptability." While he details key modifications made to H.R. 12112 by Science and Technology, he fails to list the proposal adopted to require ERDA to study possible carcinogenic impacts of synthetic fuels. Likewise, the cancer hazard is not named as such in the Fact Book made available to Congress and to the media for the transmittal of information to the public. Again, there are only references to "determining environmental impacts of commercialization." If cancer is going to be a problem, what is the administration waiting for in issuing warnings?

Dr. James Liverman, ERDA's Assistant Administrator for Environmental Safety, offers a guarded prognosis in defense of synfuels development. In his opinion, potential risks may be minimized by identification of hazardous agents, and development and employment of safety and control technologies. He anticipates that protective strategies will be implemented that would limit worker contact, which probably, he believes, accounts for low incidence of toxic effect in petroleum refinery workers. It should be pointed out that studies are only now being initiated by ERDA to compare the toxicity of petroleum distillates with that of synthetic fuels distillates. Additionally, indications are that synthetic fuels plants will be more expensive than petroleum refineries to bring to the same degree of occupational and environmental safety.

This then raises the question of what standards the current projects will be constructed to meet. According to ERDA's bio-medical staff, the air quality standards for agents that cause cancer to occupational groups are based on acute disorders produced by exposure to high levels of pollutants. Little is known or accounted for in present standards about the long-term health risk associated with low-level exposure, or the progression of the biological processes that may lead to cancer. Current water quality standards do not regulate the release of some carcinogenic agents to the public because the information for setting those standards is inadequate or non-existent. ERDA admits that continuous low-level exposure may in the long run be the major health cost.

ERDA is relying on industry cooperation to "self-regulate" to prevent what it terms the "expensive retrofitting of control devices and methods" at some later time. Moreover, we understand that monitoring will be the responsibility of industry, not ERDA, at each individual project. So we must ask, with what honesty is industry approaching the reality of this situation?

A case in point is the behavior of the Oil Shale Corporation, which is engaged in a public relations campaign to give assurance of their product's safety. Their representative, Dr. R. Merrill Coomes, spoke at the 9th Oil Shale Symposium at the Colorado School of Mines in April 1976. He doubted whether cancer-causing agents could pose any direct threat to workers at a modern oil-shale complex, ignoring the difficulty of describing with certainty the qualities of a complex that does not exist. He asserted that modern industrial hygiene practices would keep the cancer risk low, without admitting that it is unclear what exposure would be considered low risk, or that industry may not be willing or indeed able to spend the money required to keep the risk low.

On several occasions, the Oil Shale Corporation has described the results of an experiment where mice were bedded on raw shale rock and spent shale, and developed no skin cancer. They have failed to report on the condition of the lungs of the mice, although inhalation of particles represents a greater cancer hazard from raw and spent shale than contact does in inducing skin cancer. They have also failed to report on a previous experiment they have conducted, where whole shale oil produced skin tumors in 78% of the mice tested, and ungraded shale oil produced tumors in 10% of the animals.

In conclusion, we would like to ask just what Congress would be guaranteeing and for whom in agreeing prematurely to a synthetic fuels loan guarantee program. A valid accounting would include figures on how many people will be exposed and can be expected to contract cancer, what the costs of their health care would be, what the costs will be of enclosing and automating the synfuels facilities, of removing and containing toxic substances from air and water emission, of building in these precautions or retrofitting later, and how this will affect the true costs of gas and oil produced by synthetic fuels technology.

## PERSONAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR., FOR 1975

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of the Financial Disclosure Act



(H.R. 5249), which would require all candidates for Federal office, Congress-people and Federal employees to reveal on an annual basis the amount and sources of their income, which is supported by 166 Members of the House, and keeping with my conviction that all public officials should routinely disclose their personal finances to constituents, I am again making public my financial situation for the year 1975.

My income for the year consisted of my congressional salary of \$42,850, income from my ownership interest in the Conyers Partnership—automobile dealership—of \$4,607, speaking honoraria amounting to \$11,830.38, and interest income of \$58.40. My total income was \$59,345.78 and my adjusted gross income was \$53,420.17. I paid Federal income taxes in the amount of \$17,230.27, Michigan State taxes of \$2,187.65, and city of Detroit taxes of \$1,056.40.

NEW YORK ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION  
NO. 148

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with my colleagues assembly resolution No. 148, adopted by the New York State Assembly on June 2, 1976, recognizing the submittal to the House of Representatives of a resolution establishing the Select Committee on the Fiscal Problems of Cities and calling for its adoption.

Less than 1 year ago, when we were called upon to help New York City during its financial crisis, we realized that the task of solving the financial problems of the cities is very complicated and that a great deal of study is required before effective action can be undertaken. The establishment of a committee to study the fiscal problems of the cities would certainly help provide Congress with the information it needs to create a policy for handling such problems in the future.

Therefore I take this opportunity to submit the resolution of the New York State Assembly to the RECORD and urge my colleagues to establish a Select Committee on the Fiscal Problems of Cities in the near future:

RESOLUTION NO. 148

(Assembly resolution of the State of New York recognizing the submittal to the House of Representatives of a resolution establishing the Select Committee on the Fiscal Problems of Cities and calling for its adoption)

Whereas, This chamber is cognizant that there has been submitted to the House of Representatives Resolution 959 which states, in part, in its preamble:

"Whereas the House of Representatives finds that—

(1) some of our largest cities are facing fiscal problems of such magnitude as to threaten their economic viability, others appear to be moving in this direction, while still others are fiscally sound;

(2) there is insufficient knowledge as to the problems causing financial imbalance

and why they seem to afflict some cities and not others;

(3) other problems are consequences of fiscal imbalance, and it is important, though not always easy, to distinguish between causes and consequences in order to alleviate both types of problems;

(4) while it is clear that the decisions of city governments, businesses, and individuals are influenced by incentives and barriers emanating from Federal policies, programs, and actions, the magnitude of this influence—and in some areas even the direction—is not known;

(5) there is an absence of an overall policy regarding cities and their problems;

(6) partly because of this lack of general policy and partly because of the disaggregation of Federal policymaking, programs, and policies which impact upon the cities and their problems are sometimes conflicting and often uncoordinated;

(7) these problems impact not only affected cities, but the economic state of the Nation; and

(8) there is a need for the Congress to more clearly define the Federal role regarding our large cities, and to reevaluate current programs and actions which address their problems; and

Whereas, We are constrained to concur in such observations and the conclusions thus arrived at; and

Whereas, The proposal therein contained to establish a Select Committee on the Fiscal Problems of Cities to

"(1) to study the problems related to fiscal imbalance of large cities;

"(2) formulate the appropriate role of Federal and other levels of government in the solution of these problems;

"(3) evaluate existing Federal policies and programs in relation to this role; and

"(4) make recommendations on Federal legislation, regulations, and actions to alleviate these problems"

is considered by the members of the Assembly to be a most appropriate and necessary first step in meeting and dealing with the crisis in our cities; now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the House of Representatives be and is hereby called upon to take timely action in the affirmative on that Resolution and the concept expressed therein; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be suitably engrossed and transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each member thereof from the state of New York.

CARLA'S FABLE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I came across an article prepared by Nathaniel Parish, legislative chairman of the New York State Association of Renewal and Housing Officials.

I believe that this article is an accurate description of much of what is wrong with administration approaches to solving our housing problems. I would like at this time to insert this article, "Carla's Fable," into the RECORD for the benefit of our colleagues.

I'm sure that many will share the urge to laugh at this interesting tale. The sad reality of the situation, however, prevents us from doing so:

CARLA'S FABLE

Once upon a time in the affluent kingdom of Myopia, the King set about to tour the towns and villages of his vast kingdom. As he toured the towns and villages he remarked, "Even in our great state of affluence, even with our vast wealth, the housing for my people is in a very sad plight—sub-standard, I'd say." He called in his prime minister and said, "Something must be done to correct the state of housing in this kingdom."

The next day, the King called together in the palace conference room, all the ministers and counselors of the realm, to discuss the plight of poor housing in rich Myopia. "Hark ye ministers and counselors, let us solve this problem of poor housing in order that our fame may spread throughout the whole world as a kingdom of fine housing as well as fine athletic programs and Moon walkers."

Committees were formed, and sub-committees and sub-sub-committees. Plans were begun, revised, and scrapped. At last, the ministers came up with a plan and submitted it to the King. They recommended that he establish a department to deal with the problem, and that this department be called, "The Homogenous Ultraperspective Development Department". The King, who appreciated complicated titles as much as complicated committees was delighted. He appointed a minister to head the department and charged the minister with providing a workable plan to bring about improved housing in the towns and villages of Myopia.

After many months of study (for the ministers were really at their best of "study"), they arrived at what they considered a workable housing program, and reported to the King. The ministers stated that the housing program would consider only the best locations for housing that would meet the test of all of the special conditions. These included: not being in the flood plain; the provision of equal opportunity for all the residents of the kingdom; non-discrimination between the residents of the kingdom; suitable management plans with qualified managers and developers. He stated that proper environmental and property standards should be met, and that the costs of housing should be lowered to levels of the previous four years, and that the standards for housing should be increased to that of four years hence. Thus the minister decided to call his housing program "the four plus four program".

The minister then told the king that the next step was to publish all of the regulations thus established for "the four plus four program," and that the regulations be issued to all of the subjects of the realm and particularly the developers who would be asked to assist the government in providing the four plus four housing.

To explain the housing program to the kingdom, the ministers called a series of public meetings and invited all interested persons and developers so that they could explain the regulations and opportunities that were to be provided by the housing program. After answering many questions, the developers of the realm were enthused with the possibility of assisting the king and providing new housing for all of the towns and villages of the realm.

Many months later the invitations for housing proposals were issued to the waiting developers. Because of the need to expedite the housing the developers were given thirty days in which to provide the king with proposals on how they would build new housing in the towns and villages.

The developers assembled their teams of planners, architects, engineers, real estate and finance experts; and they worked night and day. At the eleventh hour all of the proposals were submitted to the department

of "homogeneous ultraperceptive development". The minister of the department said to the developers, "we thank you for your diligent efforts in providing us with proposals to build housing for the citizens of the realm in the towns and villages where poor housing exists."

The minister then said to the developers, "We will take your proposals under advisement and evaluate them and let you know within thirty days which of you will be granted permission to proceed with your housing proposal." The minister then took the proposals and one by one parcelled them out to the members of his staff to review them for site location, for standards of design and construction, for management, for financial feasibility, for equal opportunity and all of the other criteria established and not established by the staff of the department of homogeneous ultraperceptive development.

After the thirty days went by, the developers asked the minister if he was ready to determine which projects would be approved. The minister stated to the developers that "so many were submitted that we have not had an opportunity to review them all yet, as we're still getting organized and that it would take some additional time." The developers returned to their offices to wait.

After six more months the minister of housing sent out a letter to each of the developers and summoned them to the council chambers for an audience. When the developers were all assembled, the minister stated to them that because there was no project submitted that did not have at least one flaw in it, that none of the proposals would be approved and he thanked the developers for their efforts, in preparing and submitting the proposals. He stated that sometime again in the future there would be additional advertisements for proposals; and would appreciate it if they would again give consideration to submitting proposals for development of new housing in the towns and villages.

As the developers sadly left the meeting, the staff members of the ministry patted each other on the back at the good job they had done in reviewing the proposals and catching the flaws in each and regretted that there were no proposals that were approvable.

Then the minister went to the King and reported to him that the department of homogeneous ultraperceptive development had finished the review of all the proposals and that the staff had worked very diligently in rejecting each of the proposals; that none would be approved because there was a flaw in each proposal. He made recommendations to the king that each member of the staff receive a promotion for his good and diligent work in rejecting all of the proposals. The king looked at his minister, perplexed, and said to the minister, "but what about the new housing for the towns and villages?" And the minister said, "as soon as we receive proposals that meet all of the criteria, we will build new housing for the towns and villages."

Today in the Kingdom of Myopia, housing developers may be easily recognized. They are those going about gnashing their teeth in frustration. The King, absorbed in other matters, is secure in the knowledge that within the framework of the homogeneous ultraperceptive development department, the problem will be solved. Staff members of the department continue to receive salary increases for their diligence in rejecting housing proposals, and new staff members are added frequently, as flaws are increasingly hard to find.

The villagers, unaware of all the great effort in their behalf to improve housing, go about their business as usual, almost as if they didn't need improved housing.

## PARKS AND PEOPLE PRESSURE

### HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the delegation from my State has been intimately involved in the last several years with efforts to preserve some truly glorious lands in our State by incorporating them in the wilderness areas and national park systems. Few of those efforts have been without pain.

Thus, it is disconcerting, to say the least, that these successes may breed their own destructive forces.

The qualities which make wilderness worth preserving also draw the increasing throngs who threaten destruction of those values through sheer weight of numbers. The National Park Service has seemed to be fighting a losing battle for several years.

In large part, the penuriousness of the Office of Management and Budget lies at the heart of the Park Service problem. Beyond this, however, all who are interested in the fate of our national parks and wilderness areas could well contemplate this growing dilemma. In that regard, I commend to my colleagues a recent article in the Argus magazine describing the problem at Mount Rainier National Park.

I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

THE PARK PROBLEM: KEEP OFF THE GRASS?

(By Dan Seligman)

In Mt. Rainier National Park, the warm days of last week marked the beginning of spring; the snow, which covers the high alpine country for nine months, is now melting rapidly and the trails and lakes will soon become accessible once again to the hordes of backpackers and thousands of more sedate explorers who observe the workings of nature from behind closed car windows.

This influx of people and mechanized vehicles in recent years has caused a crisis in what the National Park Service calls "wilderness management." The term is a misnomer; wilderness "manages" itself if it isn't logged, mined, bulldozed, paved or trampled, but the crisis is nevertheless a real one.

As a result, The Park Service has begun what is in effect a program of "people management": an ambitious regulatory scheme of monitoring and restricting the movements of hikers and climbers in the park.

The plan is part of a nationwide effort to protect the national park system from overuse. But the specific difficulties facing the Park Service on Mt. Rainier are only a microcosm of larger, financial problems. The Ford Administration, particularly the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), has been hostile to requests for additional visitor facilities, rangers and trail maintenance crews, and the National Park Service now finds itself in a financial squeeze which may be the most serious the office has faced since the end of World War II, when the war effort had drastically depleted domestic expenditures for parks.

In Mt. Rainier, for example, the Park Service has contemplated using mass transit as a way of cutting down on the number of private vehicles which enter the park each summer. But the Service recently found that it

did not have enough money to study the problem, let alone deal with it, and transportation problems and insufficient efforts to protect and restore study remains a nebulous goal.

The financial condition of the park system was the subject of a critical report issued last year by the National Parks and Conservation Association (NCPA), an influential private Washington, D.C. group. The NCPA report said that budget cuts combined with increasing visitations have severely shortchanged the parks. The report examined conditions in dozens of parks and recreation areas and found camp sites in disrepair, deteriorating visitor centers, numerous sanitation damaged alpine areas where meadows have been trampled by hundreds of people. The latter was a comment directed toward Mt. Rainier.

The local Park Service office has tried to cope with these difficulties over the last few years by promulgating a series of rules for backpackers and climbers which include limits to the size of a hiking party (12) and a "back-country" permit system for hikers who camp overnight in the park. Olympic and North Cascade National Park have similar permit systems.

Such regulations received strong support from the state's conservation and backpacking groups, which have recognized that man's unregulated impact on the mountain is often adverse. Despite the many rugged areas and glaciers, much of the alpine country on Rainier is extremely fragile; meadow areas, like tundra, are vulnerable to overuse and take years to regenerate.

But two years ago the Park Service promulgated another and more controversial series of rules which are being challenged in federal court. Larry Penberthy, Seattle businessman and climber, filed a legal action in U.S. District Court here, charging that the Park Service had exceeded its authority in limiting the number of climbers and the location of their snow camps. The suit has not been heard yet. But Penberthy maintains the regulations are impractical and designed to keep people out of the park.

In particular, he objects to regulations which in effect require parties climbing the mountain to remain "out of sight and sound" of each other. Thus a party of 10 must remain half a mile away from the party before it, even if that party consists of only 4 persons. Penberthy also objects to the proposed closure of two low-level roads in the Park. The road closures are not being litigated—the suit applies only to those regulations on snow and glaciers above 7,000 feet—but Penberthy says the closures are unnecessary and may be part of a trend "toward closure of the (entire) park."

Conservation groups have not supported Penberthy's law suit—his militant style and pro-development attitudes (he advocates constructing 1,000 additional car-camping spaces in the Park) irritate many environmental leaders—but they may join Penberthy in opposing the road closures. It would mean a significant change on the part of the conservation groups which traditionally supported virtually any NPS restriction to curb over-use. The Mountaineers, the largest such organization in the state, has recently asked Park Supt. Tobin to consider closing the Mowich Lake road only one mile from the Lake. The Park Service proposed closing all 5 miles of the road, but Norm Winn, Mountaineer's president, says the plan may be excessive. The lake is polluted and the area around it trampled, but he suggests that blocking off the road one mile away might discourage enough visitors so that the impact on the lake would be reduced and the area could regenerate. Winn makes similar comments regarding the proposed closure of the West Side Road. The road provides access to many short hikes and Winn



says the plan to close the road eight miles from its present terminus would make several spectacular areas of the mountain inaccessible to day or weekend backpackers.

While such objections may sound like an appropriate subject for a local committee or lunch meeting, the proposed Park Service road closures and climbing regulations are part of a wilderness plan for Mt. Rainier presently before Congress. If Congress adopts the plan, as written, these changes will be in effect. It would then take an Act of Congress to amend the language, a formidable task considering Congress's ability to procrastinate or ignore more significant issues. Thus the action of the Park Service with respect to the road closures and regulations will affect thousands of park visitors every year.

Russell Dickinson, regional NPS director, is presently reviewing these areas of controversy. His decision is expected in several weeks. He could request that the present plan be modified when it is considered in committee by Congress or he could decide that the Park Service is correct and proceed with the present document.

In either case the plan does not compare in significance with the Alpine Lakes or Shishu Beach proposed wilderness areas, where a spectacular part of the state is threatened by logging and proposed roads. The Mt. Rainier debate is not a log-it-or-leave-it controversy. It's a more subtle conflict: the role of the federal government in deciding, once an area has been set aside as a park, what the wilderness experience should or should not be for a majority of park visitors.

In the case of Mt. Rainier, its close proximity to the urban areas of Washington and its symbolic and scenic value as the state's highest peak, make the NPS plans worth scrutinizing. Faced with budget cuts, the increasing demand for more park, and the conflicting concepts of wilderness, the Park Service seems to have adopted a rigid, slightly misanthropic policy of "the fewer people in the backcountry the better."

Perhaps time will vindicate this position but it seems like the Park Service has an obligation to try alternative programs, oriented toward keeping mechanized vehicles out of the park, providing buses and other forms of access to elderly citizens, and encouraging a respect for the mountain, rather than an unflexible licensing and monitoring program which may provide for administrative ease at a time of budget woes, but tends to ignore the broader mandate of 1899 when the Park was first established for "the benefit and enjoyment of the people."

#### THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE HUMPHREY-HAWKINS BILL

HON. JOHN L. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, there has been some question raised as to the constitutionality of the provision in the Humphrey-Hawkins bill which mandates that the President recommend and submit a bill to Congress. It is a matter which should be reviewed thoroughly before any decision is made on this subject. For that reason, I would like to share with you a memorandum which has been prepared by the American Law Division of the Congressional Research Service, entitled "Constitutionality of Provision

Requiring the President to Submit Legislative Proposals to Congress." The text of this memorandum follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,  
May 5, 1976.

From: American Law Division  
Subject: Constitutionality of Provision Requiring the President to Submit Legislative Proposals to Congress

This is in response to your inquiry of May 3, 1976, regarding the constitutionality of a provision in § 210(b), H.R. 50, 94th Cong., which would require President to "... transmit to Congress ... legislation creating a comprehensive youth employment ..." and other similar provisions.

There are no court decisions which would shed any light upon the power of Congress to compel the President to submit a legislative proposal. However, it may be stated that the principle of "separation of powers," embodied in the relevant constitutional provisions, while not preventing Congress from enacting such requirement, would not supply any mechanism for enforcement.

The Constitution provides that the President shall "... take care that the laws be faithfully executed, ..." Art. II, § 3. This provision imposes an obligation upon the President, and it has also been regarded as a source of independent presidential power, for example, the power to remove all executive officers without restraint from Congress. *Myers v. United States*, 272 U.S. 52 (1927); *Humphrey's Executor v. United States*, 295 U.S. 602 (1935); *Wiener v. United States*, 357 U.S. 349 (1958). In addition, the Constitution states that the President shall "... recommend ... [to Congress] ... such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." Art. II, § 3. In *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952), the Steel Seizure Case, Justice Black stated that "the Constitution limits [the President's] functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad." *Id.*, at 587. A commentator on the use of the power of the President to recommend legislation has said:

"On its face, this language only imposes a duty to furnish information to the Congress; it requires the President to lay before the legislators all facts and information which may assist their deliberations. In practice, however, the clause in question has been the source of vast power. The duty to communicate to Congress is one whose fulfillment is wholly discretionary with the President. He may report to the Congress whenever he chooses and about any subject he may deem desirable, including the duty of the Houses themselves to enact particular legislation. But the power to communicate to Congress is also the power to communicate to the nation. The Presidential message has become a prime means of mobilizing public opinion behind the Chief Magistrate's legislative program." B. Schwartz, *A Commentary on the Constitution of the United States, Part I, the Powers of Government* (1963), vol. II, 27.

Nevertheless, despite the power of the President to execute the laws and to recommend legislation, it has been stated that "In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker ... [T]he Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute." *Youngstown, supra*, 343 U.S. at 587. By Art. I, § 1, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States. ..." Further, by Art. I, § 8, cl. 18, Congress is authorized to "... make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution ..." the powers granted to Congress and "... all

other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Therefore, while the Congress could enact a statutory requirement that the President submit a legislative proposal, such a proposal would be of no effect since the Congress possesses ultimately the full power to either enact, reject, or amend the proposal. Moreover, there would appear to be no way in which the issue could be judicially tested.

The President, should he object, would be unlikely to initiate a court test but rather to take the position, simply, that he would not comply. In the event of noncompliance, assuming that one may, for instance, mandamus the President, cf. *National Treasury Employees Union v. Nixon*, 492 F. 2d 587 (C.A.D.C. 1974), or that a subordinate officer may be found to be proceeded against, *Kendall v. United States ex rel. Stokes*, 12 Pet. (37 U.S.) 524 (1838), the obstacles to bringing suit is that an injury is a prerequisite to a justiciable controversy. *United States v. Richardson*, 418 U.S. 166 (1974); *Schlesinger v. Reservists Committee*, 418 U.S. 206 (1974). No one would appear to be able to claim injury from a failure to comply with the requirement, inasmuch as noncompliance would implicate "only the generalized interest of all citizens in constitutional governance. ... Standing to sue may not be predicated upon an interest of the kind alleged here which is held in common by all members of the public, because of the necessarily abstract nature of the injury all citizens share." *Id.*, 217, 220.

STUART GLASS,  
Legislative Attorney.

#### CRIME IN AMERICA

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues the achievements of Miss Cathy Tally, who has just completed here senior year at Temple High School, Carroll County, Ga.

Earlier this year, Miss Tally was named the Junior Citizen of the Year by the Carroll County Chamber of Commerce. The daughter of Mrs. Frances Tally of Temple and P. R. Tally of Rome, she is the first student from Temple to earn this high honor in the history of the award. The Junior Citizen is chosen on the basis of recommendations from school and community leaders, school and community activities, and each nominee is required to write an essay. This year's topic was, "Crime in America: Why the Increase and What Are Some Solutions?" I will share Miss Tally's essay at the conclusions of my remarks.

Miss Tally, an honor roll student every 9 weeks for the past 4 years, was involved in a wide range of extracurricular activities at Temple High School. She has been a member of the Beta Club, 4-H Club, and Science Club serving as an officer in each and as vice president of her sophomore class, treasurer of her junior class and president of her senior class. She was nominated for the Governor's honor program for 2 years, has received the State of Georgia and University of Georgia Certificates of

Merit and is listed in Who's Who Among American High School Students and in the Society of Distinguished American High School Students.

Named a senior superlative, specifically, "most intellectual," Miss Tally was also chosen as the Temple High School 1975-76 Betty Crocker Family Leader of Tomorrow. She is involved in community activities as well, having served as a member of the Bicentennial Committee, is active in the First Baptist Church, has served as a volunteer in Red Cross and Cancer Crusade fund drives and tutored a second grade student in reading.

I join with family and friends in Temple, Ga., in congratulating Cathy Tully for her outstanding contributions to Temple High School and her community.

Following is the essay which Miss Tally wrote as a nominee for Junior Citizen of the Year. Her essay is a fine outlook on the problem of crime and I am confident that my colleagues will appreciate the relevance of her remarks as I did:

"CRIME IN AMERICA: WHY THE INCREASE AND WHAT ARE SOME SOLUTIONS?"

"The typical citizen response to the crime problem," as was noted by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, "is a demand for greater action by the police, courts, correctional institutions, and other agencies." Seldom does a citizen ask himself what he can do to lessen the problem. His involvement and participation in reducing the crime rate are of the utmost importance. If he actively works to alleviate or lessen the crime increase in his own community, then he is greatly contributing to the success of the overall criminal justice system. Perhaps, if each citizen felt this way, the crime rate would go down. I do not mean to imply that citizens alone can prevent crime. But I believe that citizen involvement is the basis for an effective criminal justice system. In my opinion, the lack of citizen involvement is one of the major causes for the increase in crime.

Why, you may ask, are citizens so apathetic about participating in crime prevention programs in their communities? First of all, many citizens have misconceptions as to the causes of crime. For example, citizens who believe that poverty causes crime are prone to place the responsibility for the prevention of crime on government agencies. Others believe that the causes for crime lie in the lower classes of society, for example, the poverty-stricken Americans. Thus, they see no reason for improving their own class. If it were brought to their attention that the majority of the poverty-stricken Americans do not engage in criminal behavior and that criminals are found in all classes of society, they might come to the realization that the causes of crime are more complex than they had thought.

Perhaps, if the concern and awareness of the citizen were sparked, they would begin to participate more actively. I refuse to believe that indifference is a factor. I honestly believe that most, if not all, citizens care about their community, and they care about the future of this country. Therefore, they care about the reduction of crime.

A citizen who recognizes his responsibility in preventing crime and who realizes that crime is a problem that touches all of society can find many opportunities for action. Even if a citizen works toward the erection of street lights in areas of crime, he is still advancing crime prevention one more step. Also, a citizen should report crimes, willingly help his police department, serve as a juror

or witness when asked to do so, and he should make sure that his own conduct is above reproach.

Concerning a community's role in the prevention of crime, one must have competent leadership. Such a leader should take the initiative in instituting programs that spark citizen awareness of their function and usefulness in crime prevention. Careful planning should go into the community's crime prevention program. This planning should involve correlating the community efforts with the over all crime picture as it relates to the entire country. Community prevention programs should also be clearly explained to the citizens. The community must also work closely with the police department as well. The community must realize that it plays a role equally as important as that of the police department. All too often the citizens of the community ignore their own responsibilities in the prevention of crime. Instead, they expect the police to deal with this aspect of the crime problem. They forget that the success of the police depends upon their support.

There are other factors that contribute to the crime increase as well. For instance, lack of subsistence, alcoholism, tobacco, drug abuse, mental disorders, lack of moral standards, all contribute to the increase of crime. Perhaps today with the present economic disorders and the high unemployment rate, the lack of subsistence is the key factor in the increased rate of crime. People are willing to steal, to blackmail, and possibly to kill in order to obtain food and other necessities for themselves and their families. The solution to this problem lies in the hands of the government as well as in the hands of the citizens. Immediate attention must be directed toward the faltering economy. Perhaps more programs should be instituted to supply help to these people. The citizens of this country must work toward helping their neighbors as their forefathers did. One must give of one's time, money, and material means in order to restore the country to her former state. Alcoholism, tobacco, and drug abuse stimulate crime as well, either crime committed while under the influence of these drugs or crime committed to obtain these drugs. I believe that if more restrictions were placed on both the usage and the obtainability of these drugs, crime motivated by them would decrease. For example, the penalties for "pot pushers" should be stiffer. The mental disorders that contribute to the increase in crime can be treated in asylums for the criminally insane. This solution would result in large expenditures; however, it would also increase employment. As to the lack of moral standards, I believe that one will soon see a "turn around" in this area. This country's moral standards have steadily decreased over the past few years. Yet, I feel that soon, if not already, the citizens of this country will see their mistake. Even now youth movements in addition to adult efforts are stimulating a return to God. Thus, one shall soon see the rise of morals.

Overall, I feel that the present rehabilitation programs in the prisons are essential. Of course, the programs are not one hundred percent effective. I do not believe that any program is. But these rehabilitation programs do work in many cases. Therefore, they are worthwhile. I also feel that paroles and pardons should not be granted as freely. The parole and pardon boards should be more selective and more restrictive. Accordingly, longer sentences should be served before the idea of a parole or pardon is ever considered. As to capital punishment, I feel that in extreme cases it should be reinstated. I know this seems very cruel, but in the words of Joe Freeman Britt, "If someone kidnapped your three-year-old daughter and raped her and slit her throat, would you still not believe in capital punishment?" In a case such as

this, I would honestly have to agree on the death penalty as punishment.

In conclusion, let me say that there are many reasons for the crime increase. However, I feel that it is the neglect on the part of the citizen that has greatly contributed to the increase in crime. If every citizen would realize this and begin to do something about it instead of criticizing the government or the police department, I believe that crime would decrease noticeably.

## THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1976 to the House. As the time for consideration by the full House approaches, the debate is escalating dramatically over the timing and the stringency of auto emission controls and over the need to prevent deterioration of clean air areas.

Many of the arguments against strong and early controls center on the possibility of adverse economic impact. However, as Michael Gerrard, a consultant for the Council on the Environment of New York City, points out in a column in this morning's Washington Post, there are equally compelling economic arguments for clean air.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share this column with my colleagues in the hope that they will join me in continuing to support the strongest measures to clean up our air and to keep it clean. Mr. Gerrard's column follows:

### THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT

(By Michael Gerrard)

Many environmentalists these days feel like residents of besieged Leningrad, as no end nears to the years-long attack on the clean air and water statutes of the early 1970s. The attackers are now most notable for their ostentatiously worn hard noses and steely glares, scrutinizing every move against pollution for its adverse economic impact.

Ironically the economic plight which inspires these attacks was largely brought on by disregard of environmentalists' warnings that overuse of energy and other resources would get us into trouble. No matter, as soon as these warnings were borne out, the environmentalists were the ones publicly flogged. The fragility of our economic recovery provides continuing excuses for ecological retreat.

That terribly rational-sounding phrase, "cost-benefit analysis," is the password of the backlash. Unfortunately, when it is used to attack pollution control the benefit side is usually neglected, while the costs are fully explored and publicized. It is like shearing an accountant's ledger in half and showing only the debits.

This process is well illustrated by the recurrent proposals to relax clean air standards in New York City by allowing utilities, industries, and large buildings to burn cheaper, high-sulfur fuel, with the unfortunate side effect of dumping tons of toxic sulfur oxides and particulates into the open



sewer above our heads. The immediate economic costs of clean-fuel regulations are lavishly expounded, while the benefits to health are often described as speculative or sentimental, and the benefits to the city's economy are usually ignored altogether.

These economic benefits of clean fuel regulations derive mainly from the damage dirty air does to metals, buildings, cloth, vegetation, and other materials. Most metals corrode faster, some of them (like nickel) nearly 100 times faster, in New York City air than in still-pristine regions. On a large scale, this means that bridges and elevated subways and highways age faster or must be repaired more often, or else the danger of collapse increases. On a small but just as economically harmful scale, air pollution damages low-voltage electrical contacts, relays, and switches. It may incapacitate semiconductors and miniaturized equipment. It requires large expenditures for cleaning and for using precious non-corroding metals like gold for the sensitive electronic equipment which is so abundant in Manhattan, the communications center of the nation.

More than \$100 million in repainting alone is required in New York City every year because of the onslaught of air pollution. Cloth disintegrates sooner and dyes fade faster in our sulfurous air, and curtains and clothing must be washed more frequently, adding a considerable expense to hotels and other businesses.

Pollution creeps through the windows and doors of our city's museums and erodes the varnish from paintings, blackens bronze objects, and tarnishes ancient jewelry. It damages paper and thereby destroys valuable records, necessitating expensive microfilming.

Airborne poisons destroy many of the city's remaining trees. Sulfur oxides deposited in the atmosphere by smokestacks travel hundreds of miles and are often then washed back to earth, causing an "acid rain" that has already damaged crops over wide areas of the Northeast and increased the acid level in streams and lakes, killing many fish.

If pollution levels rise high enough, as they could with lax fuel standards, we could be struck by what is euphemistically called an "episode," when a temperature inversion traps pollutants for several days until they accumulate to imminently hazardous levels. In that event emergency plans call for a large-scale shutdown of the city's highways and industrial and commercial facilities until the crisis passes. Just one day of this could cost the city's economy tens of millions of dollars, and one emergency could last a week or more.

Finally, high air-pollution levels tend to reduce property values. This could further erode our city's tax base, as well as our materials and our lungs.

When all these benefits of retaining clean fuel standards are tallied, they may well exceed the higher cost of the fuel. And this does not even include the now customary but still ghastly exercise of quantifying the economic damage of impaired health, through counting such costs as hospitalization, absenteeism, lost production, and burial.

Relaxing clean fuel standards is but one of the myriad of current proposals to stifle the letter and the intent of environmental statutes. I have mentioned only the economic damage caused by the use of high-sulfur fuel; that damage is rivaled or exceeded by the combined effects of automobiles, incinerators, furnaces, and other polluters, whose operators want their own special exemptions.

Nearly all these proposals are touted as ways to improve the city's fiscal and economic health, but in almost none is there full consideration of the laws' benefits as well as their costs. The hard noses and steely glares of environmentalism's critics are a good deal flimsier than they appear.

## CITY ISLANDS' "P.S. 175 YOUNGSTERS FIGHT TO SAVE THE PORPOISE"

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months the boys and girls in Ms. Alice Rotello's class at P.S. 175 in the historic, nautical town of City Island have been involved in a very important cause, that of saving the beautiful and intelligent porpoise from extinction.

These young people of class 7C have organized "Project Heart," through which they have done exhaustive research on this issue. Once they were sure of the facts they wrote to interested organizations, legislators, and newspapers to express their concern and demand action.

The youngsters are concerned about the indiscriminate killing of thousands of porpoises by tuna fishermen, whose nets entrap these ocean mammals and cause them to drown. This situation seems especially serious in light of the Marine Mammals Protection Act of 1972 which I cosponsored and which was enacted to reduce the accidental killing of these creatures to "insignificant levels approaching zero." To the youngsters' alarm, this portion of the act is not being well enforced and the extinction of the porpoise seems possible.

We are fortunate that these young people care enough to demand what is only proper and right, that the intent of the act to protect these animals be enforced and adhered to. We are also fortunate that these young people feel they can confront public agencies and legislators and get action.

Fortunately, response to the children's pleas was quick and supportive. Especially gratifying was the response of Community Planning Board 12 in the Bronx, where several youngsters made eloquent pleas to stop the killing. Their appearance before the board was warmly received and prompted that body to send letters of support to the Federal Department of the Interior and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

It is imperative that young people be encouraged to get involved in public affairs and to feel that their voices will be heard. When we see the hard work which these young people performed, their perseverance and dedication, their heartfelt concern for these beautiful creatures, we can only feel profound gratification that our young people care about and are willing to do something about the world which they shall soon inherit. It is only right that we listen to them and do something about their concerns.

In a time when apathy might seem to be an accurate description of the mood of the country, it is reassuring to see how these youngsters from P.S. 175 took matters into their own hands and decided to do something about an issue which so deeply affected them.

Since these young people are so civic minded, I want to bring their efforts to the attention of my colleagues here in the House, particularly those of my colleagues on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which will be considering legislation in this area. I hope also that others who read this RECORD will follow the example of these fine young citizens and alert their Congressmen to their views on issues being discussed in Congress. Only through effective communication with one's constituents can a Member of Congress truly be a Representative.

## SOLAR ENERGY

**HON. JOE MOAKLEY**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the July 5 edition of the Washington Post there appeared a column by Nicholas von Hoffman concerning solar energy equipment in California.

In his commentary, Mr. von Hoffman provided information from the National Taxpayers Union which cited the problem of governmental entities and utility companies rushing forward to exploit the individual's right to the Sun's rays through the taxing and renting of solar equipment.

I believe that Mr. von Hoffman's remarks are particularly relevant because they confront our Nation with the two divergent paths we can follow in utilizing the Sun for our energy needs; the path of governmental and utility exploitation of solar energy at the consumer's expense or the path of the consumer's right to solar energy, free of governmental and utility schemes of taxation and rental of solar equipment.

I hold that we must take the latter path—the path of utilizing the Sun's rays for the direct personal use of the consumer. Government should not be a deterrent to the individual's harnessing of the Sun's rays, but should be a partner in encouraging the consumer's direct use of solar energy. This is an approach that I have advocated through the solar energy community utility program—SECUP.

For the benefit of all Members, the text of Mr. von Hoffman's article follows:

TAXES: WARMING UP TO SOLAR ENERGY

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

Good news. Solar energy must be much closer to being a practical alternate fuel source than we've been led to suppose. The San Francisco Bay Area Chapter of that energetically and undeviating right-wing organization, the National Taxpayers Union, reports that several members of their state's legislature are proposing a tax on the sun.

Their specific suggestion is to lay a state tax on the solar-collectors used to heat swimming pools. The collectors are the glass or plastic squares used to gather up the sun's energy, and the proposed tax would be larger or smaller depending on the size collector a homeowner had installed to heat his pool. In this way the state of California would be

compensated for the loss of revenue from diminished use of presently taxed gas and electricity.

The Bay Area Chapter's June newsletter (1301 Berkeley Way, Berkeley Calif. 94702, \$3 a year and please don't write me) tells us Santa Clara County has already found a way to charge its residents for diverting the sun's energy directly for their personal use: "The Santa Clara Water and Sewer Department is now in the business of renting solar pool heaters, and is the sole provider in the county of such rentals. The county will install a pool heater for a \$250 fee and then charge \$150 rent on the system."

According to the newsletter's calculations, at those prices the county will realize a 30 per cent return on its investment in perpetuity. That's about three times what it would cost the same homeowner to go to the bank, borrow the money and put the equipment in himself.

None of which would be very important if solar energy were still an exclusively 21-century technology. It isn't. Fafco, Inc. of Menlo Park, Calif., has already sold equipment to heat 4,000 swimming pools. As more and more communities ban the use of scarce natural gas for this luxury, we should see a wider use of solar heating.

The hard-to-understand part is why on earth governmental entities should rush to slap a tax on a nascent industry just as it's beginning to introduce solar technology in everyday life at competitive prices.

That doesn't mean that by next summer our dearest wish will be granted and we can tell the electric company to go to hell, but it does mean that solar technology is already close enough so the politicians and the big businessmen are figuring out how to turn themselves into solar middlemen and sell you sun beams. "Under an experimental plan the California Public Utilities Commission has allowed Pacific Gas & Electric to charge customers with solar equipment on the basis of BTU's not on the basis of fuel used, as is the present method," the Taxpayers Union claims. "This means that if a house is powered 70 percent by solar and 30 percent by energy supplied by PG&E, the homeowner would pay on the basis of 100 percent used, not on the basis of 30 percent actually supplied. . . . In exchange for PG&E investment in the installation of this admittedly expensive equipment, PG&E will continue to own solar equipment into perpetuity, regardless of who owns the house, and will continue to collect monthly charges for use of sunlight from the owners and their successors."

If this comes as a mild surprise it's because we've been conditioned to anticipate a gigantic breakthrough in solar energy technology that'll change all calculations overnight. Thirty years of atomic energy propaganda has done that to us.

The more likely possibility is that solar technology will come on line, as they say in the power business, bit by bit over time. That's what happened with coal, oil and atomic energy, and you'll notice, none has completely supplanted the other.

Swimming pools are small potatoes, but hot water heating isn't. It's estimated to account for 4 percent of the nation's energy consumption, and that's no small amount of fuel. Solar-powered hot water systems, competitively priced, are believed to be available and for sale now.

The next big improvement in the day-to-day application of solar energy is expected to be in heating and cooling. The new systems won't eliminate the need of other fuel sources entirely, but as we said, this is going to be a phase-by-phase development. Some of the phases are coming more rapidly than you may think.

We should have learned by now that technology and the social, economic and legal

forms which cradle it are all of a piece. We're going to have to ask ourselves if we like the Santa Clara approach, whether we wish to continue to have the federal government direct research money toward big breakthrough development when all the progress is coming in small steps, and often from smaller companies. There are other questions concerning zoning and tax policy and none of them are going to get our thoughtful attention unless we remind ourselves that the sun now does more than make the pretty flowers grow.

## THE SHOCKING TRUTH ABOUT MEDICAL LAB REPORTS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, even in this day and age, it is no secret that the people of this Nation continue to suffer from substandard diagnostic testing conducted in medical laboratories. Quite often, unfortunately, this poor quality lab work directly results in unnecessary surgery, extended hospitalization, as well as higher costs to the patient paying public.

As the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will shortly be considering the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act of 1976, of which I am a cosponsor, I would like to bring to their attention as well as my other distinguished colleagues of the House an article published in the July issue of Reader's Digest, which I feel succinctly illustrates "The Shocking Truth About Medical Lab Reports."

The article follows:

### THE SHOCKING TRUTH ABOUT MEDICAL LAB REPORTS

(By James H. Winchester)

In California last year, a 32-year-old woman was admitted to a hospital for surgery. A lab technician performed blood tests and reported that the woman was A-Rh-positive. Shortly afterward, a second technician re-tested the woman's blood and correctly typed it O-Rh-positive. It was too late, however. The woman had already received two pints of A-Rh-positive blood during surgery. She died 12 hours later from a transfusion reaction.

A commercial laboratory in Pennsylvania recently reported that a Pap smear and biopsy of a 20-year-old girl showed "positive," meaning that she had cancer. A surgeon removed part of her uterus, then discovered that the laboratory had erred: there was no cancer.

A young cafe worker in Florida complained last year to his doctor of excessive thirst, lack of energy, and weight loss, all signs of diabetes. A commercial lab analyzed his blood and reported: "No excessive sugar." The doctor concluded that the patient did not have diabetes. Two weeks later, the young man went into a diabetic coma. Only last minute emergency action saved his life. The lab report had been wrong.

Isolated cases? Not at all. Recent and reliable studies, cited at 1975 U.S. Senate hearings, made a chilling estimate: One-quarter of all medical-laboratory tests performed in the United States are substandard or wrong. This means that millions of Americans may

be risking unnecessary hospitalization, unnecessary surgery or inappropriate, and occasionally fatal, treatment.

### FAILING THE TEST

In becoming essential and widely used diagnostic tools, the nation's medical laboratories have also become a \$12-billion-a-year business, accounting for nine cents of every health-care dollar. Their exact number is hard to pin down. The U.S. Public Health Service's Center for Disease Control, in Atlanta, estimates that half of our 14,354 clinical labs are in hospitals and half are government, private and industrial facilities; and that there are an additional 30,000 to 80,000 smaller labs in physicians' offices. Together, these labs perform over five billion tests a year—an average of 24 tests annually for every U.S. resident.

Most of these laboratories, of course, do fine, fast, accurate work. But far too many have been flunking the simplest tests. For example, a recent survey by the National Bureau of Standards examined test results in clinical chemistry from 852 labs of varying types. Only 28 percent of test samples, on average, were found to be "medically acceptable." In a ten-year study, from 1964 to 1973, the New Jersey State Health Department re-checked 35,000 medical tests made by 225 laboratories. Only 20 of these labs showed acceptable results more than 90 percent of the time, and only half of them showed acceptable results 75 percent of the time.

Here are the principal reasons for such poor performance:

Lack of effective federal controls. Despite their vital role in health care, the nation's medical laboratories are woefully lacking in uniform and meaningful federal regulation and control. To be eligible for payments for Medicare work, some 10,000 independent and hospital medical labs do need to have a certificate of fitness from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The government, though, does not itself normally inspect the facilities or test their proficiency. Instead, HEW contracts with the various states to vouch for lab acceptability—the usual result being an unchecked, rubber-stamp operation. In 1974, when the U.S. Bureau of Quality Assurance did test the proficiency of medical technologists in labs receiving Medicare payments, half of those tested failed to make even passing grades.

Only the 900 or so commercial and hospital laboratories engaged in interstate commerce have their work regularly checked for proficiency by the Center for Disease Control. Even this system, however, has proved unsatisfactory. Although CDC monitoring procedures are rated high, the Center has only ten examiners and two supervisory examiners to make on-site visits. Thus, most test samples must be mailed to the labs, whose administrators know that their analysis of that particular specimen is to be judged. Even so, CDC finds that 18 percent of the labs score below acceptable rates for even such a simple test as measuring blood sugar.

Lack of effective state controls. According to medical experts, medical-lab controls are effective in only a handful of states (California, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin are often mentioned). Only 23 other states have any requirements or laws at all, and many of these are distressingly weak, with inspections often more form than substance. When the rare official inspections do occur, the maintenance and cleanliness of some laboratories are frequently found to be seriously substandard.

Testimony last year before a U.S. Senate subcommittee on health cited scores of documented cases of dirty and broken equipment, unlabeled and outdated chemicals,



and unwashed test tubes. In one instance, inspectors for the New Jersey Department of Health found a busy medical lab operating out of a garage that did not have a sink, electrical wiring or a full set of test tubes.

As for personnel, only 18 states now require that medical-laboratory directors be licensed, and only 11 require licensing of supervisors. And just nine states require examination for medical technologists, who usually do the actual testing.

Failure of self-policing programs. The too-casual acceptance of self-policing and accreditation by professional and industry groups subject to no independent checking also results in a lack of any realistic controls. For example, the respected College of American Pathologists, whose members direct most hospital medical laboratories, conducts inspection, accreditation and proficiency testing for medical labs. Participation, however, is voluntary, and there is no enforcement power. About 1500 labs have participated in this program since it began in 1960, and approximately 75 of them have been denied accreditation. Even turn-downs do not put these labs out of business, for the approval is only an association stamp. Still, many state and federal agencies accept the College's stamp of approval in place of any inspections or controls of their own.

Proliferation of dubious trade schools. To meet demands, the number of schools turning out medical technicians is constantly increasing. Dr. Morris Schaeffer, former assistant commissioner and general director for laboratories in New York City, estimates that more than one-third of these schools are mere "diploma mills." Often, instructors of such subjects as chemistry and physiology are not even college graduates. Many career schools offer mail-order licenses. And, in some states, all that is needed to open a medical laboratory or a school to train medical-lab technologists is a mailing address and the price of a new-business license.

Prescriptions for improvement. Unquestionably, the nation's medical laboratories need to be improved—and voluntary programs alone won't do the job. Strong, mandatory inspections and controls are needed for all labs. A model for such inspections and controls exists in New York City's program, universally agreed to be the country's best.

New York's non-nonsense system started in 1964. Says Bernard Davidow, assistant commissioner for laboratories in the New York City Department of Health: "Before our crackdown, more than 85 percent of the medical laboratories tested in New York City were repeatedly unable to isolate and identify bacteria commonly encountered in infectious diseases. In addition, 87 percent of the city's laboratories failed simple chemical tests, and 18 percent could not cross-match blood properly."

Today, only two percent of New York City's medical laboratories have difficulty in identifying those micro-organisms frequently associated with infectious diseases. In 1975, only 0.4 percent of the city's labs failed simple chemical tests repeatedly, and none of them failed to cross-match blood correctly, identify gonorrhea smears, determine antibiotic susceptibility or perform accurate syphilis tests.

What caused the dramatic turnaround? A tough set of regulations. The city's 515 hospital and independent laboratories have their facilities reviewed each year by the health department before renewal of license, and all laboratory directors must have at least a Ph.D. in science. All such labs are tested for proficiency at least four times a year, and city inspectors make frequent unannounced visits. All technicians employed in the labs must be certified by the city's Department of Health, with renewal of certification mandatory every two years.

A great step will be made toward equaling

New York City's excellence on a nationwide basis if major legislation, awaiting Congressional action at the same time of this writing, is approved. Senate bill 1737, cosponsored by Sen. Jacob K. Javits (R., N.Y.) and Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D., Mass.), has just been passed. It calls for uniform federal standards for all U.S. medical labs, and stipulates that every state set requirements at least equal to those established by the federal government. A pending House bill, 11341, sponsored by Rep. Paul G. Rogers (D., Fla.), would make all U.S. medical labs subject to licensing, including the small ones in doctors' offices.

If these bills become law, they will close many of the dangerous gaps in present rules. Individuals wanting to help in what will certainly be a betterment in health care should make their views known by writing to their Congressional representatives.

#### MESSAGE OF SISTER MARY O'KEEFE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues this message, read by Sister Mary O'Keefe, at an inter-religious prayer service which took place at the Jefferson Memorial on July 4, 1976. The Peoples' Bicentennial Commission sponsored this service as a moment to reflect on the first 200 years of our Nation's history and to rededicate ourselves to the original goals of the American Revolution—democracy and equal opportunity for all people.

Though July 4 has passed, I hope that my colleagues in Congress will not forget the meaning of the Bicentennial celebration and will resolve to continue the work of the founders of our democratic tradition and our Nation. It is with this hope that I submit the message of Sister O'Keefe to the RECORD:

#### MESSAGE BY SISTER MARY O'KEEFE

Hearing anew the message of the prophet Jeremiah on this 200th anniversary of American independence brings to mind the words of the Brazilian bishop, Helder Camara, a modern Jeremiah, that more than 3/4rds of humanity are slaves to hunger, sickness, forced labor and despair while the remaining third is in slavery to selfishness and fear. Let us reflect briefly concerning those things that enslave us, that block our freedom and have harmful repercussions for the materially deprived 3/4rds of the world.

Gathered together to dedicate ourselves to strive for peace, justice and liberation we have acknowledged our social sins. Meanwhile we are afflicted by our own sword, symbolized by a militaristic mentality which increasingly dominates our national policy and affects vast portions of the globe.

The national spirit seems flawed today by its flight from truth into patterns of dishonesty and self deception. We appear as a nation to have lost our compass. Are we perhaps suffering in a special way from the famine spoken of by the prophet Amos? "A famine not of bread, a drought not of water, but that of hearing the word of Yahweh!" Is the prophecy of Isaiah being fulfilled in us?

You will listen but not understand, see, but not perceive, for the heart of this nation has grown coarse. Their ears are dull of hearing and they have shut their eyes for fear they should see with their ears, under-

stand with their heart and be converted and healed by me.

Have we ceased to be a caring nation? Caught up in a consuming fear of an exaggerated external threat, in a greed for profit, and plagued by a thirst for material good and a national addiction to power—to being number one—have we lost sight of the more genuine threats to our security—bad housing, hunger, unemployment, polluted air? While we build B-1 bombers, test deadly cruise missiles and expand our Trident program, thus escalating both the arms race and the military budget—all in the name of defense—our nation's cities struggle to stay afloat, to keep their services functioning, and our unemployed and elderly poor seek to survive each month with insufficient food stamps and income, with inadequate health care. Should not their insecurity be a major concern?

America, despite its great heritage appears to have sold out to consumerism, to the purveyors of products geared more to corporation profits than to human needs, to producers of weapons for war which now only add to overkill.

As a nation can we fail to recognize that our freedom, our democracy, if it is to be genuine, must be intertwined with the freedom of others? Have we lost sight of our heritage of values—we who ought to be dedicated to outlawing that poverty which leaves so many throughout the world in subhuman conditions and violates economic justice. Must we not concern ourselves with restructuring an economic and social system which enables the few to usurp the national wealth while they become enslaved to a greed for profit and power and are inhumanly detached from the needs of humanity.

As we rededicate ourselves today let us endeavor to expose the false peace our leaders offer us by piling up nuclear weapons ever higher. How can our security really rest here? Is it fostered through arms sales to countries on every continent to the tune of nearly 10 billion dollars last year? Need we ask who are the chief beneficiaries of our rise to the dubious role of number one arms salesman to the world?

It seems we must learn anew, as one U.S. Senator tells us that the "central source of American strength lies not in the power of its armaments nor the size of its bankroll, but in the central values for which this nation stands—individual liberty, human equality, due process, and justice."

We must continually call those in high places to a public account of their leadership, to their use, or abuse of power, we cry out against sinful social structures and institutionalized violence. We dare not separate our own struggle for personal integrity from the economic, political and social struggle to liberate the 3/4rds of humanity from its slavery to hunger, sickness, forced labor and despair. Let us also pledge to fight against our own selfishness and fears; for fear leads to an overblown concern with security, national and domestic, to a breakdown in trust. Selfishness generates pride close us off from the rest of humanity and increases tension and division. As Helder Camera warns us "selfishness which has grown to global dimensions makes solidarity and real peace between people impossible." It must be resisted actively and intelligently, first and foremost, within each of us.

Peace, justice, liberation. These cannot be separated and can never be won once and for all—the struggle is ongoing. Let us speak the word of truth and issue the call to build a peace rooted in justice which will liberate us from selfishness and fear. As we celebrate this day of jubilee let us be conscious with Isaiah of our urgent task today to "bring forth the people who are blind, yet have eyes, and are deaf, yet have ears," for we are that people!

## CABLE TV: THE BOTTLED-UP MEDIUM

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Communications begins the second part of a comprehensive set of hearings on the subject of cable television. These hearings mark the first time in 15 years that Congress has taken a hard look at the regulatory scheme that the FCC has established with respect to cable television.

Coincidental with these hearings, the July/August 1976 issue of the Columbia Journalism Review carries an excellent article by Ronald P. Kriss, a senior editor of Time magazine, that discusses many of the issues which will be debated before the subcommittee during the next few weeks.

Having already listened to several weeks of testimony regarding cable, I say to my colleagues that this is an issue which on first blush may seem fairly simple but which upon examination proves quite complex. Because so much of the literature requires an understanding of the FCC's cable rules—which even some of the rules' drafters confide they do not understand—I thought my colleagues might find this article useful.

I must point out that author Kriss' employer, Time, Inc., owns Home Box Office, the Nation's largest pay cable service. Having noted that fact, I must add that I do not believe that it in any way colors what I regard to be a very good report on the cable/broadcast debate. I commend it to my colleagues:

## CABLE TV: THE BOTTLED-UP MEDIUM

(By Ronald P. Kriss)

Until the last decade or so, over-the-air broadcasters regarded cable television with tolerant condescension, as a convenient auxiliary that brought clear pictures—including pictures of detergents, deodorants, and dandruff cures—into thousands of otherwise unreachable homes and thus provided a rationale for raising advertising rates. Cable still serves that function, but broadcasters no longer regard the industry merely as "a grubby infant," as Business Week described it in 1971. For now, after twenty-seven years, cable is assuming the menacing aspect of a rival medium.

The vast potential of cable has long been recognized. Where over-the-air broadcasting—even with U.H.F. channels—is limited to a comparative handful of frequencies, cable can potentially deliver up to eighty interference-free channels over long distances. The implications are enormous. The promised abundance and versatility of cable has stimulated planners to talk of a "wired nation"—a universal medium that would not only carry greatly expanded educational, cultural, and civic programming but would permit two-way communications with its audience and bring into being a dial-a-libraries, facsimile newspapers, remote-controlled shopping, data transmission, banking by wire, electronic mail delivery, and instant national referenda.

Although most observers assume that eventually such uses of cable will come to be, they have remained vague about cost and timing. As Les Brown put it in The New York Times: "Whether cable will be a medium

unto itself, instead of an aid to TV reception, has never been a question; the question has always been when. Optimists still predict it will happen in the 1980s; pessimists give it longer, some not until the 21st century."

Back here in the 1970s, the question of cable's emergence is more narrowly drawn; will cable be permitted to develop as technological and economic circumstances permit, or will government regulation, supported by over-the-air broadcasters, impede or halt its progress? During the first half of 1976 this issue has produced an unbecoming dogfight between broadcast and cable, and it looks as if a reluctant Congress will have to attempt a settlement.

Until recently, broadcasters have had little cause for alarm, because government has supervised cable to the point of strangulation. The chief regulatory body, the Federal Communications Commission, is not wholly to blame; Congress left a legislative vacuum and the F.C.C. moved in. Moreover, it moved in with the concept that cable was, and always would be, subservient to broadcasting. Partly as a result of this attitude, cable's growth has been slow; barely a quarter-century after its inception it has attained a "penetration," as broadcasters call it, of only 15.3 percent of American homes, compared with 97.5 percent for over-the-air television.

Now there is growing consensus in the government that cable has been shackled too long, but it is a difficult time to do anything to the extent of trying to draw new—and long overdue—legislation, the odds are that no law will emerge before the national-convention recess, and probably not before 1977, if then. A presidential election year is hardly prime time for any legislation affecting broadcasters, let alone something as touchy as this. As agencies of a White House fine-tuned to the campaign, the F.C.C. and the Office of Telecommunications Policy are unlikely to push for policy changes, and the dependence of members of Congress on broadcasters is even more obvious.

Moreover, the opposing sides offer little ground for consensus. Broadcasters depict cable as a parasite, a shameless freeloader living off conventional television's sweat and ingenuity. The cable industry sees the broadcasters as a coddled, over-protected special interest that rakes in outrageous profits, thanks mostly to its fortuitous possession of a limited resource, the airwaves.

The two sides were put on a collision course last February, when the Communications Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce issued a staff report on cable TV. It was the first comprehensive congressional study of the industry since the early 1960s, and the authors pulled few punches: "The FCC has continually refused to confront the basic issues presented by cable television and is not likely to unless Congress provides the impetus," they wrote. They accused the F.C.C.'s Cable Bureau and Broadcast Bureau of being "shills" for the industries they were supposed to oversee, and they charged the commission itself with "following a protectionist policy."

"It has chosen to interpret its mandate from the Congress," they wrote, "as requiring primary concern for individual broadcasters rather than for the needs of the audience being served." The F.C.C., the authors went on, kept a tight rein on cable TV "largely because of its threatened impact on conventional broadcasting."

To rectify this situation, the report urged in a statement particularly chilling to broadcasters that the government abandon its reliance "on any particular technology as the chosen instrument of national communications policy." Specifically, the report recommended:

Amending the Communications Act of 1934 to cover the cable industry and to acknowledge its importance in the national communications system.

Easing the rigid rules curtailing cable's

ability to pluck signals from distant transmitters and the restrictions on programming for pay television.

Requiring that cable operators pay reasonable fees to copyright owners, which they do not now do. ("Cable's growth," the report rightly noted, "cannot be based on such an unfair foundation.")

Enacting a "rural telecommunications act," patterned on the Rural Electrification Act that brought light to the nation's countryside, to finance low-interest loans for building cable systems in remote areas.

None of the parties was entirely pleased. Some of the cable operators grumbled about the copyright proposal. Independent critics complained that the rural loan provision would leave the government deeply involved in cable's activities. But the sharpest outcries came, naturally, from the broadcasters. The National Association of Broadcasters branded the report as an effort "to replace the great system of over-the-air broadcasting in the United States with a wired nation which would cost over \$200 billion in construction costs alone." (When broadcast lobbyists really get worked up, they put the cost of wiring the nation at \$1 trillion. Estimates cited in Ralph Lee Smith's *The Wired Nation*, published in 1972, ranged from \$15 billion to \$123 billion, depending on the extent of the system and its range of services.) ABC warned that the existing television structure "should not be undercut by a subsidized wire service at tremendous additional cost which would serve only the small minority who can afford it and will have access to it." In a similar vein, NBC complained that the report betrayed "an elitist approach" that departed from the basic American concept of "a free broadcast system."

Progress since has been slow. The Communications Subcommittee had intended to hold hearings in March, when Washington was still buzzing about the staff report. But political infighting helped delay the fifteen-day hearings until mid-May, when the report had had time to cool.

There were other problems. Pressed by Ronald Reagan, that archenemy of Washington, President Ford had made a point of relaxing the federal government's regulatory hand. The White House sent Congress proposals for "deregulating" the airline, rail, and trucking industries, and cable TV was next on the list. For months, the White House had been studying proposals aimed at increasing competition between cable and over-the-air television. But ideology had to give way to prudence. As Paul W. MacAvoy, a member of the president's Council of Economic Advisers and a leading advocate of deregulation, told The New York Times: "The industry screamed bloody murder." The White House backed off.

MacAvoy hastened to add, however, that the industry's rage was not the chief reason for hastily dropping cable deregulation. "Those who propose change," he said, "have the burden of coming up with the evidence about its probable impact." The pro-cable forces had not produced convincing evidence; one subcommittee source referred to a "research gap." The broadcasters, meanwhile, had come up with hair-raising figures. In a White House memo that was leaked in April, MacAvoy quoted the N.A.B. as saying that if cable TV were permitted to import an unlimited number of distant signals into an area, "over half the stations in the country would be driven out of business."

Since 1949, when it was developed independently by engineers in Pennsylvania and Oregon, cable has grown steadily. By January 1, 1961, there were 640 cable systems, serving 650,000 homes. A decade later, the number of systems had increased to 2,500; the number of subscribers had grown to 4.9 million. Today some 3,450 systems are wired, by means of 190,000 miles of cable, to 10.8 million homes in all fifty states plus the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and Guam.



What may be more significant is that while cable is available to only 30 percent of U.S. homes, fully half of these have been wired. According to some estimates, by 1981 cable will be available to 50 or 60 percent of U.S. homes. If half of those homes were wired, that would mean close to 25 million subscribers to cable TV.

While cable was growing, Congress kept hands off. In the absence of specific legislation, the F.C.C. began to take charge of the industry, usually to protect local stations.

In 1972 the F.C.C. issued a ruling that managed both to alarm broadcasters and nearly kill cable. Since 1966 the commission had maintained a freeze that barred cable systems from entering the "top 100" TV markets (led by the New York metropolitan area, with close to six million TV households) without express F.C.C. approval. The 1972 order lifted the freeze, but at the same time required cable systems plunging into the top 100 to provide at least twenty channels, half of them reserved for education, cultural, and public access programs.

The cable operators thought it was the breakthrough they had been seeking. True, they weren't all that happy about having to maintain public-access channels and to provide those who sought access with video equipment to boot. "The industry," one civic-minded cable spokesman said loftily, "cannot afford to sacrifice itself on the altar of public good." Still, they foresaw a bonanza in the big cities—and nearly went bust. In rural areas, cable could be strung for as little as \$3,500 a mile; in cities, it has been known to cost as much as \$80,000 a mile. In rural areas, one of cable's prime attractions was improved reception; but many big cities already had excellent reception—except for New York, with its skyscrapers, and Los Angeles and San Francisco, with their canyons and valleys.

Cable operators were also authorized to introduce pay television, which had been tried experimentally, and usually unsuccessfully, in the 1960s. Under it, subscribers may pay either a flat monthly surcharge or a per-program fee for first-run films, sports events, and other attractions. At the beginning of 1973, pay systems had only 16,000 subscribers throughout the U.S. By the beginning of 1976, there were 500,000.

From the first, broadcasters demanded stern "anti-siphoning" rules to keep pay TV from outbidding the networks for top attractions. As the House Communications Subcommittee puts it, "Siphoning is a word used by broadcasters, no doubt because it evokes the image of a cable operator robbing the broadcaster of his programming." One critic of the broadcasters notes that with pay TV accounting for perhaps 1 percent of all TV homes, "Anti-siphoning regulations are akin to protecting an elephant's feeding rights against interference from a mouse." To the broadcasters, however, this is a mouse that someday, soon, may roar: according to ABC officials, figures compiled by the Stanford Research Institute show that by 1985 the pay TV industry may be able to spend nearly \$900 million to acquire programs; the three networks spent \$1.1 billion in 1974 for that purpose.

Despite cable's financial struggle in the big cities, it had one very important thing going for it. From the early 1970s, in the universities, the courts, and government offices, a feeling seemed to be growing that cable should be at least partly freed from restrictive regulations and given a make-it or break-it chance in the marketplace.

Late in 1971, an eighteen-month, \$500,000 study commissioned by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation gave powerful impetus to this feeling. On the Cable: The Television of

Abundance saw little risk that either many local stations or networks would wither as cable audiences grew. But the report went on: "If over-the-air television is to fall victim to technological change, it is in no different position from any other enterprise in which investments have been made, and possesses no greater right than other industries to protection from technological change." No greater right than, say, the radio or film industries possessed when television happened along and mugged them both.

Four years later, yet another blow for cable was struck by the Committee for Economic Development, a private nonpartisan organization of 200 business and educational leaders which produces thoughtful, well-researched policy papers on a variety of current issues. Noting that business "has a stake in the diversity of voices competing in a free market," the C.E.D. urged: "In the transition from scarcity to greater abundance and diversity, broadcast policy should rely more on competitive market forces and less on government regulation. Fair competition among the technologies should be encouraged." The C.E.D. did have major caveat. "There are cogent arguments," it said, "for protecting the established broadcast service if a competitive system deprives the public of present benefits without offering the prospect of future improvements. What is needed, therefore, is a national policy that strikes a reasonable balance between the promotion of diversity through cable and the preservation of an effective system of over-the-air broadcasting."

Easier said than done. For years, the F.C.C. has been promising to formulate such a policy and submit it to Congress. So has the White House. Congress, for that matter, has promised to come up with its own plan. Watergate slowed the effort; election-year politics has slowed it further. Still, there has been some movement, however glacial.

The Justice Department has filed a number of briefs in behalf of the cable industry, and has warned the F.C.C. that its efforts toward shielding the broadcast business could lead to a "dismal swamp of protectionism." In the Senate, Edward Kennedy and Philip Hart are sponsoring a "competition improvements act" designed to ease broadcasting's stranglehold over cable. The Senate Judiciary Committee, meanwhile, has completed its proposed revision of the Copyright Act of 1909. Its bill, S. 22, calls for a statutory schedule of fees for cable operators based on gross receipts: one-half of one percent of the first \$40,000 would be paid to the Register of Copyrights for distribution to copyright holders; 1 percent of the next \$40,000; and so on to a top fee of 2½ percent on gross receipts of \$160,000 and over.

A House Judiciary subcommittee is also moving toward copyright legislation, and it is weighing the Senate approach as well as a couple of other, more complex ones. Thoughtful cable executives agree that without a revamped copyright law to cover their business, there is not likely to be an effective overall measure. "The most urgent need is a resolution of the copyright issue," said a congressional aide who is sympathetic to the cable industry. "The cable operators have got to be made to pay for the material that is the foundation of their whole industry." But as the House subcommittee is learning, finding a formula that everyone can live with is devilishly difficult.

There are other thorny issues. Exclusivity, for instance. If a cable system is allowed to pipe a great number of signals to its subscribers from stations near and far, how can a local station prevent duplication of its own programming? And if broadcast television is weakened, will the poor be penalized because they cannot afford to pay the \$10-a-month fee that prevails in some places?

Clearly, any legislation that is produced in the next year or so will have to deal with some high-insoluble problems—problems of competition versus protectionism, the role of the marketplace, the question of reasonable profits, the whole direction of electronic communications, the social impact of cable.

Beyond all that is perhaps an even tougher issue than any of these. "People are limited in the amount of information they can absorb," the C.E.D. noted in its 1975 report. "If the move from scarcity to abundance in communications does not guarantee better or more complete information, if it only guarantees more, then it may well serve no constructive purpose."

For all its promise, the fact is that cable is still a long way from guaranteeing anything much more than—well, more.

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM J. MAHONEY

#### HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1976

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to Dr. William J. Mahoney of Liberty, Mo., and to his unselfish contribution to the medical and health care field in my home State. Dr. Mahoney is employed full time by an international firm, but devotes significant amounts of his time to voluntarily addressing numerous groups on the topic of drug abuse. His daytime engagements are arranged through the gracious cooperation of his employer, but most of his appearances are on his own time, freely given. These speaking engagements have taken him throughout the State to address people of all ages and groups of all kinds. Virtually every high school student in the Liberty school district has heard an extremely educational presentation from Dr. Mahoney on the dangers of drug abuse. He has made many adult groups aware of the problem, and they have overwhelmingly expressed their appreciation.

In addition to this extremely worthwhile public speaking program, Dr. Mahoney has worked ceaselessly to improve the medical care available in his section of Missouri. He has served on the boards of directors of Downtown Hospital, Doctor's Osteopathic Hospital, and Children's Cardiac Center, all of Kansas City, Mo. His contribution to the training of family physicians at the Kansas City College of Osteopathic Medicine was recognized by his citation by the American College of General Practitioners.

Dr. Mahoney has been instrumental in the establishment of an extensive disaster and emergency medical care system. Working in concert with several of his colleagues, he organized the Hospital Medical Co. for Clay County. Through his far-reaching interaction with members of his profession, he has been able to keep the Civil Defense Emergency Hospital one of the best staffed of its type in the Nation. He has trained countless young doctors in the various aspects of emergency medical care, thus insuring

that efficient, intelligent relief work can progress in the event of a disaster.

Dr. Mahoney's training of osteopathic physicians, who are the backbone of medical care in rural Missouri, has

helped fill a great, unanswered void in my district. His unselfish, tireless dedication to the medical profession has served as an example and an inspiration to all in his field. Mr. Speaker, on behalf

of the citizens of Missouri, I would like to commend Dr. William J. Mahoney on his genuine humanitarian concern, and express deep gratitude and a sincere appreciation of his efforts.

## SENATE—Wednesday, July 21, 1976

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.—Revelation 3: 20.*

O God who bids us in this high and holy moment to open our hearts to Thy presence, make us receptive to Thy coming. If Thou dost come to us in the quiet pause, help us to hear Thy still small voice. If Thou dost come in the noisy tumult of the needy throng, may we welcome Thy message. If Thou dost come as one hungry or tired or sick, help us to open our heart-door in compassion. If Thou dost come as one in quest of justice, help us to be just. If Thou dost come as the pleading voice of conscience, give us ears to hear Thy message. However Thou dost speak to us, may we hear Thee, and hearing Thee obey Thee in our labor in this place. When our work is done give us the rest of souls at peace with Thee. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 20, 1976, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today for the purpose of considering certain nominations only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

### ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 5 minutes.

### U.S. SWIMMERS IN OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I commend the U.S. Olympic team for its perform-

ance to date in the summer Olympics at Montreal.

In particular, I wish to call attention to the fine performance of the U.S. swimmers, who have won their fifth gold medal. What particularly interests me in addition to the success of our team in many of the meets was the fact that Jennifer Chandler, of Lincoln, Ala.—a very small town in Talladega County, Ala.—retrieved some self-respect, as reported in the Washington Post, for the women in red, white, and blue by overcoming inconsistent East German judging to win the 3-meter springboard event.

Miss Chandler, age 17, totaled 506.19 points for the 10 dives and received her gold medal from Henry Hsu, the International Olympic Committee member from Taiwan.

I commend this young lady who, as I say, comes from a very small town in my home State. Those of us who saw her on television were thrilled with her performance.

She has brought credit to her local community, to her State, and her Nation by her very fine performance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the Washington Post article of July 21, 1976, having to do with Miss Chandler be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTREAL, July 20.—The United States men's swimming team maintained its 1,000 Olympic batting average tonight as Brian Goodell and John Hencken captured gold medals in world-record time.

That makes five world marks in five races for the fastest, noisiest group that ever terrorized a swimming pool.

Jennifer Chandler of Lincoln, Ala., retrieved some self-respect for the women in the red, white and blue suits by overcoming inconsistent East German judging to win the three-meter springboard event.

Chandler, 17, totaled 506.19 points for the 10 dives and received her gold medal from Henry Hsu, the International Olympic Committee member from Taiwan.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

### REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the provisions of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, I transmit herewith the tenth annual report of the National Endowment for the Humanities for fiscal year 1975.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 21, 1976.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:59 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the bill (S. 2054) to amend sections 203 and 204 of the Communications Act of 1934, with an amendment in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5503. An act for the relief of Divina Mamuad;

H.R. 7404. An act for the relief of Christine Donnelly;

H.R. 10210. An act to require States to extend unemployment compensation coverage to certain previously uncovered workers, to increase the amount of wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax; to increase the rate of such tax; and for other purposes.

H.R. 10434. An act for the relief of Carlos Montenegro Gorbitz, doctor of medicine, Mrs. Gorbitz, and their two-year-old son;

H.R. 11076. An act for the relief of Ok Ja Choi;

H.R. 11347. An act to authorize conveyance of the interests of the United States in certain lands in Salt Lake County, Utah, to Shriners' Hospital for Crippled Children, a Colorado corporation;

H.R. 12224. An act to amend section 1234 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of the grantor of options in stock, securities, and commodities;

H.R. 14291. An act to provide for an elective Governor and Lieutenant Governor of American Samoa, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14311. An act establishing certain accounting standards relating to the Panama Canal Company.

### COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH UNDER THE PRIVACY ACT

A letter from the President of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, the